

A N
A N S W E R

To a Book entituled,
AN ACCOVNT
OF THE
Church Catholike;

Where it was before the Re-
formation; And whether *Rome*
were or be the Church Catholike.

Wherein is proved,
That the Catholike Church never
was, nor can be distinct from that which
is now called, *The Church of Rome.*

† By *R. T.* Esquire.

*Concordes omnes sumus, unum & idem
sentientes: quare qui societatem no-
stram devitat, is nē lateat sinceritatem
vestram, quod seipsum à tota Ecclesia
abruptit. Basil. Eust.*

Printed at Paris. 1654. R





AN
ANSWER
TO
A late BOOK,
Entituled
An Account of the
CHURCH CATHO-
LIKE, &c.

THough every idle Pamphlet deserves not the pains of an answer, yet since new and dangerous Doctrines have so far over-spread this Nation, and taken such firm root in the hearts of the people, that any defence thereof (though never so weak) shall be readily imbrac'd and highly magnified; I esteemed it not altogether

A 2

ther

ther un-necessary, to endeavour by this Reply to undeceive the deluded multitude, who are commonly carried away rather by the authority of some person (in their opinion) eminent, then by force of Argument.

I should much wonder, that so worthy a person, as report ha's represented D. Boughen to the world, should be the Author of so unworthy a Pamphlet, did I not consider the horrid effects of pride and malice, how they not only tempt wretched souls out of the right path that leads to eternall felicity, but spur them on also to a violent opposition of Gods sacred truth, till at length they break out into open blasphemy against God and his holy Church, for which God forsakes them, leaving them to their impious and damnable errors, to maintain which, the most learned and subtile of all Heretiques are forc't to fly to fallacious and ridiculous Arguments, which though to some unwary reader they may at the first appearance seem to carry some shew of truth, yet upon more mature examination they will be plainly discover'd to be but false and deceitfull colours; and such are all the Arguments in these Answers to the two Letters of Mr. T. B. which I doubt not
but

but I shall evidently demonstrate to any impartial reader.

SECT. 1. First then Mr. T. B. desires the Doctor to shew him the *Catholike Church* distinct from the *Church of Rome*, and those in her *Communion*: The Doctor answers, *That the particular Church of Rome is to the whole Catholike, as a particular member is to the whole body; and therefore as the whole body is distinct from a particular member, or a particular member from the whole body, so is the particular Church of Rome distinct from the whole Catholike.*

Rub up your *Logick Doctor*, or let me advise you to go once more to the *University*, and converse a while with the young *Sophisters*, who will tell you of a fallacy call'd, *Ignoratio Elenchi*; which indeed runs through almost your whole book: For let us set these two *Propositions* against each other, and then see whether we can discover any contradiction between them.

1. Prop. *The Catholike Church is not distinct from the Church of Rome, and those in Communion with her.*

2. Prop. *The particular Church of Rome is as distinct from the whole Catholike, as a particular member is from the whole body.*

Where is the contradiction? if both these Propositions may be true (as certainly they are) where is the conclusion contradictory to the Proposition? But let us help the *Doctor*, and form his Argument into a Syllogism, and then perchance we may discover a contradiction.

Ma. *Every particular member is distinct from the whole body.*

Min. *But the particular Church of Rome is a member of the whole body.*

Concl. *Therefore the particular Church of Rome is distinct from the whole body.*

I must here ask again, where is the contradictory Conclusion to the Proposition? but perchance we wrong the *Doctor*; in making that his *conclusion*, which he intended for his argument to the conclusion contradictory. Let us try that way then, and see what will follow.

The particular Church of Rome is to the whole Catholike, as a particular member is to the whole body: Ergo,

The **C**atholike Church is distinct from the Church of Rome, and those in Communion with her.

An excellent consequence, which every young Sophister will laugh at. But let us try one way more, for I would fain make something of it; let us help the *Doctor* with another Syllogism.

Ma.

Ma. The particular Church of Rome is distinct from the whole Catholike. But

Min. The Church of Rome, and those in Communion with her, is the particular Church of Rome. Ergo:

The Church of Rome, and those in Communion with her, is distinct from the whole Catholike.

Here, I confesse, is some apparency of contradiction in this conclusion; but then what a ridiculous *Minor* is here! By the same way of argumentation I will prove *Westminster* and the *Suburbs of London* to be within the walls of London. Thus:

Ma. The particular City of London is within the walls of London. But:

Min. The *Suburbs of London*, and the City of *Westminster* adjoyning thereunto, are the particular City of London. Ergo:

The *Suburbs of London*, and City of *Westminster* adjoyning thereunto, are within the walls of London.

If the *Minor* were as true as the *Major*, the conclusion would necessarily be true, but the *Minor* is as false as yours, and yours as this; for you must know, good Doctor, that the Church of *Rome*, and those in Communion with her, are as much distinct from the particular Church of *Rome*, as the *Suburbs of London*, and

City of *Westminster* are from the City of *London*.

Señ.. 2. Besides, there is great difference between the *Roman Church*, and the particular *Church of Rome*; the *Roman Church*, and the *Catholike*, being *synonima's*, signifying one and the same thing: And though in that demand of *Mr. T. B.* the *Church of Rome* may, in *sensu diviso*, be limited to the particular *Church* or *Diocesse of Rome*, yet in *sensu composito*, that is, being joyned to the following words, [and those in Communion with her] the *Church of Rome* is of as full and ample latitude and extension, as the whole *Catholike Church*. And thus may be answer'd that triviall and childish objection against these words, [*Roman Catholike*] as if they implied a contradiction, they being but (as I said before) *Synonima's*, both expressing the whole *Church* in her amplest latitude; for the *Church of God* is *Catholique*, in respect of her Faith; *Roman*, in respect of her denomination; *Catholike*, in respect of her doctrine; *Roman*, in respect of her discipline; *Catholike*, in regard she is not confin'd to one Nation, People, or Kingdome, but invites the whole world to her Faith and Communion, willingly imbracing all that will

will come unto her; *Roman*, in respect all particular Churches and persons whatsoever, that are within the Communion of the Catholike Church, are united in, and subject to one Head, the Bishop of the particular Church, or Sea of *Rome*, as being *S. Peters Successor*, and appointed by Christ to be his Vicar on earth. Thus have we vindicated that expression of [*Roman Catholike*] from contradiction; that denomination *Roman*, added to the Church, being as universall, and having as large a signification as the word *Catholike*, which notwithstanding might have seemed an unnecessary addition, had it not been long since occasion'd by some Heretiques, thereby to distinguish true from pretended Catholikes, for those Heretiques well knew, that they could neither justify their new doctrine, nor draw people to their opinion, but by usurping the name and title of *Catholikes*, therefore the word [*Roman*] was added to [*Catholike*,] that those Heretiques that had forsaken the Communion of the *Roman Church*, might not deceive the vulgar under the notion of *Catholikes*.

3. And here by the way Doctor, I desire you to observe, that there was never any Schismaticque, or Heretique, nor any

Sect, or Congregation of men professing the name of Christ divided from the *Catholike Church*, but did either actually or originally seperate themselves from that Church, which is now call'd, and ever was, since the Apostles times, the *Church of Rome*, and therefore must necessarily have formerly been in Communion with the same Church, which is an argument unanswerable, that there was never any *Catholike Church* distinct from that, which is now call'd the *Roman Church*, or *Church of Rome*.

4. But in the examination of this discourse, I have discover'd another fallacy in the Doctor, which the *Logicians* call, *à dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*. For though the Church of Rome in some respect, viz. as she is the particular Diocese or Sea of the Bishop of Rome, may be call'd a particular Church; yet as she is the Center and Fountain of Unity, in whom all the particular members of the *Church Catholike* are united, she is, and may be truly and properly call'd, the *Catholike Church*. And now, good Doctor, the discovery of these two fallacies might serve for a full and sufficient answer to (almost) your whole book. But let us proceed.

4. Now

5. Now the Doctor begins to muster up his arguments against the Church of Rome, to prove she is not the *Catholike Church*. And first, *If the Church of Rome* (sayes he) *be the Catholike Church, where was the Catholike Church before She became a Church?* Here I expected the Doctor would have begun to speak sense, but it will not be. Let us then examine the Argument.

There was a time before Rome was a Church, therefore at this time the Church of Rome, and those in Communion with her, (for those words Doctor, must not be left out, though you are pleased to take little notice of them) is not the Catholike Church: Or thus. There was a Catholike Church before Rome became a Church; therefore now at this time the Church of Rome, and those in Communion with her, cannot be the Catholike Church: What strange consequences are these? as if the Catholike Church cannot take Her particular denomination from Rome, though there were a Catholique Church before Rome was converted to the Christian Faith. But to answer you in a word, before S. Peter translated his chair from Antioch to Rome, the Catholike Church could not take its denomination from

from Rome, but afterwards it might, and did, and that denomination of Roman it retains to this day, and ever will, till *S. Peters* Successor shall translate his See from Rome to some other City, which (in all probability) neither you, Doctor, nor I, shall ever live to see.

6. But let us examine this argument a little further. Mr. T. B. desires the Doctor to shew him the Catholike Church distinct from the Church of Rome, and those in Communion with Her: The Doctor answers, *That there was a Catholike Church before Rome became a Church; and therefore that was not the Roman.* Here the Doctor has spoke something, though nothing to the purpose, for who ever question'd that conclusion? The Doctor has forgot himself again, for his conclusion should have been this, *Therefore the Catholike Church was distinct from the Church of Rome, and those in communion with her;* and then let us see what a fine argument here will be.

There was a Catholike Church before Rome became a Church; therefore the Catholike Church was distinct from the Church of Rome, and those in communion with her. Very pretty. Rome was no Church at all; therefore the Church of Rome.

Rome was distinct from the Catholique Church. You must not say Doctor, that I impose this conclusion upon you, the argument is your own, and you think it so strong, that you urge it again, Sect. 22. and though you have not thus set it down in expresse terms, yet is it necessarily involv'd in your discourse.

7. But I have not yet done with this monstrous argument. Mr. T. B. desires the Doctor to shew him the Church *Catholike* distinct from the Church of Rome, and those in Communion with her, for the last 1100. yeares: The Doctor answers, that *there was a Catholike Church before Rome became a Church.* Here we shall have another fine consequence.

There was a Catholike Church before Rome became a Church, viz somewhat above 1600. years since.

Therefore the Catholike Church has been distinct from the Church of Rome, and those in communion with her, for these last 1100 years.

Most excellently concluded, Mr. Doctor; in brief, the effect of the argument is this.

There was a time when Rome was no Church at all, therefore for these 1100. years last past, the Church of Rome,
and

and those in Communion with her ,
have not been the Catholike Church.

Just so will I prove that D. Boughen
has not been a Doctor of Divinity for
these five years last past.

There was a time when D. Boughen was
no Doctor at all, therefore D Boughen
has not been a Doctor of Divinity for
these five years last past.

Into what a Labyrinth of absurdities has
the poor Doctor cast himself.

8. Let us now proceed to the next ar-
gument, , and sum it up, as far as it is ca-
pable, into a syllogisticall form.

*If Rome be the Catholike Church , then
if she be Orthodox, the Catholike Church
is Orthodox; if she be heretical, or schis-
matical, the whole Church must be hereti-
cal and schismatical; but the Catholique
Church was never heretical or schisma-
tical , and yet the Church of Rome has
been miserably schismatical & heretical;
schismatical, as is to be seen in Platina &
Onuphrius, when she had sometimes two,
sometimes three Bishops together, a dou-
ble, a treble-headed, a monstrous Church.
Therefore Rome cannot be the Catholike
Church.*

I am sure the Church of Rome was ne-
ver so monstrous as this argument. The
Doctor

Doct^r is fallen so deep into a fallacy, that he cannot tell how to get out. M.T.B. demands one thing, and the Doct^r layes about him to prove another. But let us examine the argument.

If by *Rome* you meane the particular Church, or *Sea of Rome*; first, it is impertinent, secondly, I deny your consequence, at least, as to its latter part, for the Catholike Church ha's not that necessary dependence on the particular *Sea of Rome*, as that she must be hereticall or schismaticall, when *Rome* is so. *Rome*, as it is a particular *Sea*, is but a member of the Church Catholike, and therefore if she should by schism or heresie cut her selfe off from the Catholike Church, yet would the Catholike Church remain in her integrity and purity, as a man would not cease to be a man, according to his essentiall parts, though some corrupt and incurable member were cut off from the body; but if you mean by *Rome*, the Church of *Rome*, and those in communion with her, I then deny your supposition, or your minor proposition, as to that part; for the Church of *Rome* in that latitude is not at all distinct from, but is the very same with the Church Catholike, which can never be hereticall or schismaticall; wherefore if
the

the Church of *Rome* ha's had sometimes two, sometimes three pretended Bishops together (as you seem to have learnt out of *Platina* and *Onuphrius*, though you cite no particular place in those Authors) yet there could be but one true Bishop of *Rome*, one true Head of the church, the rest being meerly pretenders, and therefore they themselves, and all those that adhered unto them were schismatiques, and as long as they obstinately continued in their schism, they were no members either of the Catholike Church, or the particular Church of *Rome*, the Catholique Church stil remaining pure and entire, and the Sea of *Rome* a true member thereof.

9. But the Doctor goes further, and charges the Church of *Rome* with heresie, even from the confession of her own men.

I must be bold to tell you, Doctor, that your charge is as false as your doctrine: There was never any Catholike that confest the Church of *Rome*, and those in communion with her, to have been hereticall; for that had been to have confest the whole Catholique Church to be hereticall, and so utterly extinct, which is impossible; neither was there ever any Catholike that confest, the whole Diocesse, or Sea of *Rome* was ever hereticall; so that
whether

whether by *Rome*, you mean the particular Church of Rome, or the *Roman Catholike Church*, your assertion is most impudent and false, neither have you nam'd any one man that confest it.

10. But perchance the Doctor intended these arguments for light skirmishes onely, and ha's reserv'd his main force and reason for his last assault, and with this reserve hopes to obtain a signall victory over the Church of Rome. Let us then encounter it, and try what force it brings with it.

If Rome (sayes he) be the Catholique Church, if any thing be amisse in any particular, the fault is Hers, and She ought to mend it; therefore Rome is not the Catholike Church.

What a wretched consequence is this? certainly the Doctor ha's forgot all his *Logick*, or found out some new, which nobody knows besides himself; by the same ridiculous consequence I will prove that the Parliament of England was never the Supreme Power of England; Thus.

If the Parliament of England were the Supreme Power, if any thing were amisse in any particular, the fault was in the Parliament, and it ought to have mended it; therefore the Parliament of England was
never

never the Supreme Power of England.

Yet notwithstanding your ridiculous consequence, I will grant your conclusion, as being nothing to the purpose; for your conclusion should have been this; *therefore the Church of Rome, and those in communion with her, are not the Catholike Church.* And if we examine the sequell of the *Antecedent*, we shall find it as ridiculous as the whole consequence; for why should the church be blam'd for any thing that is amiss in any particular point of doctrine, or discipline, and that in any particular church, or member of the Church Catholike? (for by [particular] you must mean one of those, but which I know not) *Arius* denied an high point of Catholike Faith, and many of the Eastern church would not observe *Easter-day*, according to the *Apostolique* custom of the Catholike Church, but I cannot see, why the blasphemy of the one, or the *Judaizing* of the other should be imputed to the Church of *Rome*, and those in communion with her, which is the Catholique Church; she used all her power and endeavours to reclaim both, and when heretikes have forsaken her faith, or schismatiques her communion, she ha's always used that power and authority wherewith God ha's inve-

invested her, to cause them to return to their faith and obedience, but if the schismaticke shall persist in his schism, or the heretique in his heresie, the fault is in them, not in the church; that you, Doctor, most obstinately continue in your heresie, the fault is yours, not the churches, she ha's employed her utmost endeavours to reclaim you, and therefore cannot justly be blamed for your heresie or schisme; but if any particular Bishops or Pastors have been negligent in reclaiming heretiques or schismaticques, they must answer for it, still the church is blamelesse.

10. In the next place the Doctor discourses concerning the Visibility of the Catholique Church, which he grants to have been alwayes visible, both in, and from the time of the Apostles to this present day, but he will not grant it alwayes visible in one and the same place, no not to Rome it self, nor to every eye.

Ans. The Doctor will be alwayes proving that which was never question'd, but by his leave, the Catholique Church ha's been alwayes visible at Rome, even from its first conversion to the Christian Faith, to this present day, as far as the Catholique Church can be visible in any particular branch or member; but who e-
ver

ver said or thought, that the whole Catholike Church was at any time visible at Rome? that City, we know, was never so capacious, as to be able to contain all the Catholikes that have been for these many ages, living at the same time in *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Africa*.

11. And that it has not been alwayes visible to every eye, (who ever said it was?) he endeavours to prove, because *Elijah* saw not the church of *Israel* in his time, and because the church was not visible to many in the days of *Rehoboam*, of *Ahaz*, and *Manasses*.

Ans^r. If that church were sometimes so obscured, that it might be invisible to many, nay, to most of that Nation (for it could not be, and be totally obscured, and invisible to all eyes) yet, good Doctor, you cannot deny, but that the church was apparently visible, both before and after *Elijah*, before and after *Rehoboam*, before and after *Ahaz*, before and after *Manasses*; but neither you, nor all the Protestants in the world can shew, that at any time, not only for these 1100. yeares last past, but for 1600. yeares, even from *S. Peters*, to these our dayes, there was any Catholique Church distinct from the church of *Rome*, and those in communion with

with her, whereas that church ha's beene most perspicuously and apparently visible to the world in all ages, since the Apostles time to this present time: Besides, that the Catholike Church should be visible in times of hottest periecution, and so visible, that we can even at this day point at it, and that afterwards, when it was more glorious, it should become invisible to all eyes (as that church must be which was distinct from the church of Rome, and those in communion with her) and that for so many hundred yeares, transcends any mans understanding, but D. Boughens.

12. *It is more then probable* (saith he) *that there were in this very Island 7000. soules that were not tainted with Popish errors;* but he brings not so much as a probable argument for it: By *Popish Errors* he means the antient doctrine of the Roman Catholike Church; but it is most improbable, that there were so many as seven (besides such as were condemn'd for Heretikes, and confest to be such, even by Protestants themselves) that before *Luthers* Apostasie were separated from the Roman church, for there was not so much as one man or woman that followed *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or any other Protestant whatsoever in their new Doctrine, or imbrac't

brace their new Reformation, as you call it, but had been before a profest Roman Catholike.

13. *It is enough for us* (sayes the Doctor) *to prove them to be errours, to be against Scripture, and the received sense of the antient church.*

Ans. For shame, Doctor, recall your words, I am sure that this speech must proceed from much impudence or ignorance, they were never yet prov'd to be errors against Scripture, some indeed have barkt against Gods church, and blasphemed her faith and doctrine, (as you have done in this Pamphlet) wresting the Scripture to their damnable purposes; and I am sure, that of all men you will never be able to prove them so: But what can be more apparent to the world, then that all Antiquity confirms the doctrine of the Roman church, and condemns yours.

14. That which you say concerning the Popes, *Liberius, Honorius, and Jo. 12.* shall be answer'd hereafter in a more proper place.

15. But the Doctor is sure, that he has manifested, that the Church of Rome, and those particular churches in her communion, are not, cannot be the Catholike Church.

Ans.

Ans. Indeed he ha's made it so manifest, that no body can see it; for if this conclusion [*The church of Rome, and those particular churches in her communion, are not, cannot be the Catholike Church*] be either expressly, or implicitly in any thing that he ha's said before, I will then lay down the cudgells, and never lift up my hand more against D. Boughen.

16. In his following discourse, I confesse the Doctor seems to say more then ever he said before, viz. *That the church of Rome, and those in communion with her, might be a Catholike, but not the Catholike Church, a part, but not the whole.*

Ans. But, good Doctor, saying is one thing, and manifesting another; this must not be beg'd, but prov'd; all that he said before was, that Rome was a particular church, and this too was but only said, not prov'd at all; and now he (at least) seems to draw neerer to the question, and say, *that the church of Rome, and those particular churches in her communion, are but a part of the Catholike Church; and that therefore the Catholike Church is of a larger extent, and comprehends within her bounds more churches then those only that are in communion with the church of Rome.*

This

This is easily said, but where are your proofs? where is your Scripture for it? or where is your authority of Fathers or Councells for it? can you, or any man else shew, that at any time, between the times of the Apostles, and *Luthers Apostasie*, there was any particular church divided from the church of Rome, and those in communion with her, and yet acknowledged either by the church of Rome, or any in communion with her, or by any Catholique Father, or any Catholique Councell, to be a true member of the Catholike church? if this cannot be shown (as I am most certain it cannot) why should we take it upon your word, *that the church of Rome, and those in communion with her, is not the Catholike Church, but a part only thereof?* was there ever any particular church (not in communion with the church of Rome) that sent her Bishops and Prelats to any General Councel, wherein the whole Catholike Church was represented? or did ever any General Councell receive Bishops, or permit them to sit and vote there, that were sent from any such church, or that would not acknowledge their subjection to the Bishop of Rome, as the common Pastor, and visible head of Gods church? 'tis very strange, that

that there should be whole churches, whole countreyes and Nations, all true members of the Catholike Church, and so acknowledged, that were not in communion with the church of *Rome*, that is, never acknowledged any subjection to the *See* or Bishop of *Rome*; and yet that there should be no Records thereof, that all these should be invisible to the world for these 1600. yeares together. These are strong arguments against you, Doctor, what arguments you will hereafter bring for your selfe, I know not, but as yet, I am sure, you have brought none at all.

17. I commend your wisdom in concealing the words of those Canons by you cited. Sect. 10. for you plainly perceived that they made nothing for you. That sixth canon of the *Council of Nice*, which seems most to strengthen your cause, and ha's been so often objected by your party, and so often answer'd, ha's been prov'd upon diligent examination, to make directly against you, as appeares plainly: *Concil. Calc. Act. 16.*

18. But the Doctor is much scandaliz'd at the maiming of the Lords Supper; so that if there were no other cause then that, he could not communicate with the Church of *Rome*. Sect. 11. It seems, Do-

ctor *Boughen* cannot content himself with that, wherewith the good *Primitive Christians* were all satisfied. They could be contented to carry the *blessed Sacrament* to their houses, and reserve it there for times of necessity under one *Species*. They thought it sufficient to minister it to their sick under the *Species* of Bread onely, to their children (when that by some was thought necessary) under the *Species* of Wine onely, but the Doctor will have both, or none. None of the antient Fathers, nor the most learned of all the *Primitive Christians*, could ever find it in *Scripture*, that Christ ordained the *blessed Sacrament* to be given in both kinds to all sorts of people; but Doctor *Boughen* is so quick-sighted, that he ha's discover'd that which the whole church for 1500. yeares together could not find out.

19. But, good Doctor, how do we rob the Laity of Christs bloud? if those creatures of Bread and Wine be after Consecration, truly, really, and substantially chang'd into the body and blood of our blessed Saviour? then those that receive his body, receive his blood also; for whosoever communicates under one *Species* onely, receives both the body and bloud: And if there be no such change (as I am sure, accor-

according to your doctrine, there is not) then we rob them, at the most, but of the sign or signe of Christs blood; neither indeed is it in the power of the Priest, or church to rob them of that; for if the cup after consecration be but a bare sign or figure of Christs blood, still retaining its former nature and substance of wine, then may any one, in spite of the Priest or church, take a cup of wine, when and where he please, and make it to himselfe a sign of Christs blood, and so it may be to him as perfect a Sacrament, as if he received it from the hands of the Priest.

Perchance you will say, it is not a signe but by verue of Consecration: This may be easily said, but can you prove it out of Scripture, which you make the sole rule of your Faith? If you can, then will I subscribe to your opinion, if not, (as I am most certain you cannot) then according to your owne Principle, neither you, nor I, nor any man else is bound to believe it.

20. But here I meet with two Authorities out of *S. Cyprian*, to prove, that none can be fit for Martyrdome, that communicate not under the Species of Wine as well as of Bread: certainly the Doctor (to say no worse) misunderstands *S. Cyprian*,

pria, for he was too great a Scholar to maintaine so false and ridiculous a doctrine; his words in the first place cited by the Doctor, are these, *Quomodo ad Martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, si non eos ad bibendum prius in Ecclesia poculum Domini jure communicationis admittimus?* Cypr. li. 1. Epist. 2.

I answer, that all this Father intends in this Epistle to Pope *Cornelius*, is; to desire the Pope, that those, who for fear of persecution had fallen from their faith, might upon their repentance and reconciliation to the church be admitted to the holy communion, that by the vertue and power of that Sacrament they might be the better able to encounter with, and overcome a new persecution. There is not so much as one word in the whole Epistle concerning the insufficiency of communicating under one Species onely, or the necessity of communicating under both, those words [*Poculum Domini*] the cup of our Lord, signifying there the blessed Sacrament in generall, in allusion to the former words, [*Poculum Martyrii*] the cup of Martyrdom: and this will most plainly appeare to anyone that shall impartially read that Epistle; all that can possibly be proved out of those words, is, that in some places
in

in or about the time of *S. Cyprian*, the Laity were admitted to communicate under both kinds, which no Catholike ever denied or question'd; and that it was a custome even in *S. Cyprians* time to administer the Communion in one kind only, may easily be prov'd from those two miracles recorded by the same Father, *Serm. de Lapsis.* to which I refer the Reader.

The other place cited out of *S. Cyprian*, has these words, *Quomodo possumus propter Christum sanguinem fundere, qui sanguine Christi erubescimus bibere?* Lib. 2. Ep. 3:

Ans. These words I confesse are *S. Cyprians*, but they are lesse to the purpose then the former, as I shall instantly make it appear.

There were certain Heretikes in *S. Cyprians* time, who contrary to our blessed Saviours institution (as this Father sayes) would consecrate in wine alone, without any mixture of water; and others who would consecrate in water alone, without wine: against these latter *S. Cyprian* intends these words cited, saying, that such drink not the blood of Christ, since water cannot by vertue of consecration, be chang'd into the blood of Christ, by reason of the defect of wine, which is the true

matter of the **Sacrament**, and therefore could not have the power and efficacy of the **Sacrament** to enable men to overcome those great difficulties and temptations of persecution, and to lay down their lives for the faith of **Christ**. But there is not one word in that whole **Epistle** concerning receiving the **Sacrament** under one or both **Species**.

21. Now to passe by divers impertinencies, and such things as have beene already answer'd, let us come to the **Doctors** Master-argument, (for doubtlesse he esteemes it so, otherwise he would not so much have insisted upon it, and repeated it so often) which to set forth in its full lustre, he has at last adventur'd on this **Syllogism**.

If ye (the Church of Rome) have at any time denied Jesus Christ to be the true God, and eternal life, ye were at that time no church, but an Anti-christian Synagogue.

But this did Marcellinus, and Liberius, and Jo. 22. all Bishops of Rome. Ergo; In those times ye were no church, but an Anti-christian Synagogue.

Ans. What an Anti-christian Syllogism is here? Anti-christ ha's not more heads, then this Syllogism ha's termes. But let us be once more favourable to the Doctor,

stor, and help him to speak sense; he means well, though he ha's forgot his Logick: all then that I can make of it, is this.

There was a time when *Rome*, and all those in communion with her, were no church at all, but an *Anti-christian Synagogue*.

Therefore the Catholike Church, which never failed, must be distinct from the Church of *Rome*, and all those in communion with her.

This I confesse is a pretty good consequence, but the Doctor may thank me for it: Well then, not to question the consequence, we deny the antecedent which is prov'd thus:

Marcellinus and *Liberius*, and *Jo. 22.* all Bishops of *Rome*, denied Jesus Christ to be the true God, and eternall life. *Ergo*:

There was a time when the Church of *Rome*, and those in communion with her were no church, but an anti-christian Synagogue.

Ans. This is your consequence, Doctor, not mine. Would not you have laughed at me, or any man, that should have concluded the whole church of *England* to have been formealy hereticall and schismaticall, because the King, or *Arch bishop* of *Can-*

terbury, (one whereof you acknowledged head of your pretended Church) was Heretical, or Schismatical? Must every Church stand or fall with its *Bishop*? Must the particular members of the Church of *Rome* necessarily forsake their faith, if her *Bishop* fall into Heresie, or Idolatry? You confess, pag. 9. 10. that there was a visible true Church of the *Jews* in those dayes, when both their *King* and *High Priest* had forsaken the true God, and committed Idolatry; and must the Church of *Rome* totally perish, if her *Bishop* forsake his faith? Shall the Church of the *Jews* have a prerogative above the Church of *Christ*? This is *Logick* I understand not.

21. And though this might serve for a full and satisfactory answer, to any judicious and impartial Reader; yet since I find divers good *Popes* falsely charged with Heresie and Idolatry, I shall endeavour, *Ex superabundanti*, to vindicate them from those foul aspersions, and so destroy the *Antecedent*, as well as the *Consequence*, by shewing, the *Doctor* is here as much out in his *History*, as he was before in his *Logick*.

22. First then, *Pope Liberius* is accus'd of *Arianism*, but falsely; for he never subscribed to that damnable Heresie, never decreed,

creed, taught, or maintained it. He subscribed only to the banishment of *S. Athanasius*, to which the Emperor *Constantius* forc'd and compel'd him by torments; as *St. Athanasius* himself testifies in both his *Apologies*, where he clearly acquits him of *Heresie*. And if *St. Athanasius* in another place, and *St. Hierom* charge him with subscribing to *Arrianism*, it is to be understood, *interpretative* only; in that he subscribed to *S. Athanasius's* banishment, which was procur'd by the *Arrians*; and externally communicated with some *Arrian Bishops*: especially since not only those ancient Authors *Socrates*, lib. 2. *Eccl. Hist.* c. 29. *Sozomen.* lib. 4. c. 10. *Theodoret*, lib. 2. c. 16, 17. but also *S. Athanasius* himself in the fore-cited places testifies, that he was no *Heretique*, and that he did nothing in compliance with the *Arrians*, but what he was compell'd unto by a tedious banishment, and force of torments. And that all *Italy*, and *Spain* should side with this Pope in that *Heresie*, as you afterwards charge them, (*Seet. 23.*) is most notoriously false, spoken *gratis*, without any authority, or ground whatsoever.

23. The second Pope that stands charg'd with *Heresie* is *Honorius*: but what his heresie was, the Doctor declares not. Tis true,

some Heretiques have charg'd this Pope (upon what ground I know not) with joyning with the *Monothelites* in their heresie: but it cannot appear, that ever he held or taught that Heresie, either publickly or privatly. His errors were at the most but conjectured by some private Letters, which after his death were published in his name. But that in his life time he renounc'd that Heresie, appears, *Epist. Honor. ad Sergium. Act. 13. sext. Synod.* Yet suppose *Honorius* had erred; what was that to the Church of Rome? she notwithstanding might be free from error. And that *de facto*, she was free, and persecuted that heresie, *Pirrhus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, being at her suit banish'd by *Heraclius* the Emperor, appears plainly by *Platina*, in *Honor. 1.* and *Sabellicus Ænead. 8. lib 6.*

24. In the next place comes in *Zepherinus*, charg'd with *Montanism*; but most unjustly. He was no *Montanist*; only one of a candid and peaceable disposition, he endeavoured to make peace between the *Catholiques* and the *Montanists*; and this was all his Heresie. That place of *Lyra* by you cited, in *Mat. 16.* makes rather against you then for you. He sayes there, that some Popes have *Apostatiz'd*, and thence concludes, that the Church depends not on any

any particular mans person, but consists in those that profess the true faith of Christ. He sees not your consequence ; That because the Bishop of Rome falls into Heresie, therefore the Church of Rome must be Heretical ; but maintains the contrary.

25. But behold *Marcellinus* an Idolater, who denyed Christ, and offered sacrifice to Idols. *Ans^r*. So also did S. Peter deny his Master. *Marcellinus* externally denyed Christ for fear of torments ; so did St. Peter for fear of the Jews : yet they both confest Christ in their hearts, though they both grievously sinned in their external denying of him : But as S. Peter repented, and afterward became a glorious Martyr ; so likewise did this blessed Pope follow S. Peter, both in his Repentance and Martyrdom.

But what is this to the Church of Rome? Did all the rest of the *Apostles* deny Christ, because S. Peter denyed him ? I suppose, no man of reason will say so ; and if not, why should the whole Church of Rome be said to forsake her faith, because her Bishop for fear of torments denyed Christ in some exterior action, as S. Peter had done before him by oaths, and execrations ? Perchance, you will say, that S. Peter was not as truly chief of the *Apostles*, and head
of

of that Church. which was then in being, when he denyed his Master, as *Marcellinus* was Bishop of Rome. To this I answer, that our blessed *Saviour* had then founded his Church, viz. the night before S. *Peters* denial; when he gave an end to the *legal types and ceremonies*, and instituted the *substance*, the blessed *Sacrament* of his precious body and blood.

The Church thus founded, S. *Peter* must necessarily be the head thereof, and consequently chief of all the *Apostles*, unless you will deny the *Apostles* to be part of that Church, which was then in being. And he that shall deny S. *Peter* to be head thereof, gives *Christ* the lye; who formerly had made that promise to S. *Peter* in plain and express words, *Matth. 16. 18. Thou art a rock, and upon this rock will I build my Church.* *Christ* said not; thou art *Peter*, and upon this *Rock* will I build my Church; as you falsely translate, to deceive the world; but, *Thou art Cephas*, (which in the Syrian language, which our *Saviour* then spake, signifies a *Rock*; and upon this *Cephas* (that is, this *Rock*) will I build my Church.

Our blessed *Saviour* used not two different words, as you would make the world believe, as [*Peter*] in one place; and [*Rock*]

[*Rock*] in the other; but in both places used the word (*Cephas*) which signifies a *Rock*, that being the name which *Christ* gave to *Peter* when he first call'd him. And though the *Catholike Translators* of the *New Testament*, who profess to follow exactly the vulgar *Latin Edition*, as being more authentick, then any *Greek Copy* now extant in the world, have translated that place, as you do, viz. *Thou art Peter*, &c. yet have they dealt more ingeniously with the world, in advertising, that the word [*Peter*] signifies a *Rock*; and that our *blessed Saviour* used not two, but one and the same word [*Cephas*,] which signifies a *Rock*, in that promise made to *S. Peter*; whereas you, though professing to follow the *Original*, yet when it makes against you forsake it, and follow the *Latin*; and when that makes against you, then you pretend to follow the *Original*. Thus you will always have a shift to delude the world, and your own souls; for had you in that place followed the *Original*, you should have translated it, [*Thou art a Rock*,] not [*Thou art Peter*:] besides in the *Greek* the words are $\Sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \Pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ which word $\Pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ signifies a *Rock*, as truly, and as properly as $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$.

So then *Christ* founded his Church on
S. Peter

S. Peter as a Rock, as the very connexion of the words demonstrate: For in these words of our blessed Saviour [*I say unto thee (Peter,) thou art a Rock, and upon this Rock will I build my Church.*] Can any reasonable man imagine, that by those words [*This Rock*] Christ meant any other Rock then that whereof he made mention, in the words immediately preceding, viz. *Thou art a Rock*?

It is then most apparent that Christ built his Church on **S. Peters** person, at least, as to the Discipline and Government thereof, and consequently upon his Successors. For if our *blessed Saviour* knew that his Church, even in her very infancy, when the Apostles themselves inspired with the *Holy Ghost*, where a great part thereof would stand in need of some supreme Head and Governour; certainly he foresaw, that when his Church should be more ample, and numerous, and more subject to divisions and factions, it would stand in far greater need of an *Universal Head*, wherein all particular Churches, and members thereof might be united; and therefore would not leave it without some *common Pastor* to guide and direct it. And I desire you to take notice *Doctor*, that herein all the Fathers, both *Greek and Latin*, *Antient*

cient and modern, unanimously agree; and that this common and supreme Pastor of *Christs Church* ever was, and ever must be *S. Peters* Successor, who hitherto (ever since *S. Peter* plac'd his Chair there) has been the bishop of *Rome*, and for ought we know, ever will be till the end of the world. And this those very Authors, *Stella* and *Lyra*, whom you have cited for your self, will plainly tell you, even in those very places which you have cited.

Besides, who ever confirm'd the acts of any lawful General Council, but the Pope? In his absence had he not his *Delegates*, who sat in the supreme place of the Council, though they were not alwayes Bishops, and that even in the *Easterne Church*? I could be more copious in this point, but I here intend a reply only, not a *Treatise of Controversie*.

26. I come now to Pope *John 22.* who stands charg'd with a strange and monstrous Heresie, viz. for affirming, that *God the Son* is greater then *God the Father*, and the *Holy Ghost*, and *Stella's* authority is produc't to prove it.

Ans. I confess *Stella* has accus'd him of it, but I must be bold to except against his authority and testimony in this matter of fact; for it cannot appear that *Stella*
spake

spake this upon any just ground, or probability; for no man besides *Stella*, either *Catholique*, or *Heretique* (that I could ever yet read or hear of) ever charg'd Pope *Joh^a 22.* with that blasphemy: 'tis true, some *Heretiques*, and amongst the rest *Calvin* (*Inst. li. 4. c. 7. Sect. 28.*) have charged this Pope, for affirming, that the souls of men were mortal, but most injuriously, for he never taught, nor held the mortality of the soul; all that he held contrary to the opinion of the world was, That the souls of the Just should not see God before the *Resurrection*. This opinion was far from Heresie, the Church never having defin'd the contrary, and divers ancient *Catholique Fathers* being of the same opinion; neither did he ever absolutely defend that opinion, as an unquestionable truth. For as *Joh. Villanus. Histor. li. 21. cap. 19.* reports, the day before his death he declar'd, that he never had any intent to define it, and that whensoever he discoursed of it, his end was to find out the truth, and added withall, that he held the contrary opinion to be more probable, and I am sure it is most improbable, that *Ockam* his bitter enemy should charge him with this, and *Calvin* with the other, and yet neither of these should make any mention of that blasphemous

blasphemous Heresie which *D. Boughen* one of *Stella* layes to his charge; if either he had been guilty, or they could have found any probable argument, or colourable ground, that he might be guilty of that horrid blasphemy: but suppose this had been true, as it is far from all probability of truth, what is this to the purpose? What if *Liberius*, *Marcellinus*, and *John 22.* all *Bishops* of *Rome*, had their private errors? what is all this to the Church of *Rome*? your *Intelligencer Stella* (even in that place by you cited) will tell you, they erred as private persons only, not as bishops—of *Rome*, or *Heads* of the *Church*; they never decreed, nor defin'd Heresie; they never commanded any heretical Doctrine to be receiv'd as a divine truth by the whole Church: They might fall into errors; so likewise did *Peter*, (as *Stella* sayes) even after *Christ* had prayed for him, that his Faith should not fail. But I suppose no man will be so unreasonable, or blasphemous, as to say, *Peters* Faith failed, after *Christ* had prayed that it should not fail, though externally for fear of the Jews he denied it: *Peter* then denied his Faith, what was this to the other *Apostles*, and the rest of *Christs* Disciples? *Liberius*, *Marcellinus*, and Pope *John 22.* had their errors,

errors, what was this to the Church of Rome? had you read *Stella* but a very few lines further, you would have found small incouragement to have cited his authority for your opinion; for though he seems in some sense to grant your *Minor Proposition* (as you call it Sect. 18.) in your mishapen Syllogism, Sect. 17. viz. *That Liberius, Marcellinus, and Iohn 22. erred in Faith*, yet he there plainly denies your conclusion, viz. *That therefore in their times the Church of Rome became no Church, but was an Anti-christian Synagogue*; His words in Luc. 22. 31. the very place by you cited, are these, *Ecclesia enim Antiochena, Alexandrina, & Constantino-politana, saepe defecerunt à fide; Ecclesia verò Romana nunquam defecit; quia Christus ait Petro; oravi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua. The Church (saith he) of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, have often fallen from their faith, but the Church of Rome never fell from her faith, because Christ said to Peter, I have prayed for thee, that thy Faith fail not.*

You see *Doctor* what a plain testimony here is against you, out of the same *Author* which you have cited for you: *Stella* was not so sharp-sighted as to see your consequence,

quence, viz. That beause Marcellinus, Liberius, and John 22. had fallen from the true faith, therefore the Church of Rome had forsaken her faith; but the contrary he maintains expressly, viz. That although Liberius, Marcellinus, and John 22. all Popes of Rome, denied the true Faith, yet the Church of Rome never failed, or fell from her faith: He could not draw your Conclusion from such Premises as yours are; and yet doubtless he knew a Syllogism, and a rational consequence as well as you.

27. But why should *Vigilius* be an *Eutychian*? was it because out of reverence and respect to the Council of *Calcedon*, he could not be induc't, neither by the persuasions, nor threatnings of the Emperour, to repeal an Act of that Council, in condemning those *Tria Capitula*, which the Council had receiv'd as Orthodox, nothing favouring the Heresie, either of *Nestorius*, or *Eutyches*, one whereof was the Epistle of *Ibas*, who publicquely in the Council renounc't the Heresies, both of *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*; another, the writings of *Theodoret* against *Nestorius*, for which *Theodoret* had formerly been depos'd by the *Eutychian* Faction in that Latrocinial Council at *Ephesus*, and afterwards restor'd

stor'd by the Catholiques? I confess this is a very strong argument, that he was no *Eutychian*: but that he was one, you only say it, you alledg no reason, you cite no authority nor testimony, but that of *Lyra*, whom I cannot find making any mention at all in the place by you cited in *Mat. 16.* either of this *Vigilius*, or of any other Pope whatsoever, only in general terms he sayes, That some Popes have apostatiz'd, which is nothing to this purpose.

28. To the Question, where your Church was before the Reformation, Sect. 19. (I suppose Mr. T. B. used not the word [Reformation] but by it, I conceive, you mean, your separation from the Roman Church) To this Question, you say, it was answered; *In the Catholique.*

Ans. I confess the answer is most true, when you were a Church, you were in the *Catholique Church*; so also were formerly the *Arrians*, *Macedonians*, *Pelagians*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Donatists*, &c. all these before their respective Reformation, that is, before they fell into Heresie and Schism, were within the walls of the *Catholique Church*; before their separation, they were all in communion with the Church of Rome, and therefore true members of the *Church Catholique*; so likewise were

were you ; and as the *Arians*, &c. by forsaking the communion of the Church of *Rome*, and opposing her doctrine and faith, cut themselves off from the communion of the *Catholique Church*, and so ceast to be members thereof, even so have you now ceast to be any Church at all, by separating your selves from your *Mother Church*, the Church of *Rome*, with whom you had been in communion for the space of almost a thousand years together, even from the first conversion of this Nation to the *Christian Faith* by *S. Augustine*, to *K. Henry the Eighth's* apostasie.

29. *Before the Reformation* (you say) we communicated with *Rome*, and since we have not ; that's no fault of ours, ye will not suffer us to communicate with you, unless we communicate with your errors ?

Ans. This is very fine : who, I pray, shal judg of those errors ? *Christ* has made his Church Judg of your errours ? what Heretiques ever were there in the world, that did not, or might not have us'd the same Plea for their separation from Gods Church ? Was there ever any particular Church that presum'd to censure the doctrine of the *Catholique Church* ? Or was it not excessive pride, if not madness in you, to think that you were wiser then the whole

whole Christian world had been for 1500. years before you? Can you shew, that in any age since the Apostles, the *Catholique Church* held and taught your doctrine? can you prove that ever any particular Church, or Nation, taught or maintain'd the same? nay, I will go further; can you produce any one man, in any age from *Christs Passion* to *Luthers Apostasie*, let him be of the *Clergy* or *Laitie*, either *Catholique*, or *Heretique*, that agreed with you in all points of your Faith and Doctrine, wherein you now dissent from the *Church of Rome*? if you cannot, methinks your selves should condemn your selves for separating from that Church; in whose Faith and communion all your Ancestors for so many ages liv'd and died, and embracing a new Doctrine (and that out of your owne judgement and fancy onely) for which you have neither precedent nor authority.

30. And yet I must confess that your Religion is not altogether new, it is a Religion, for the most part, patcht up of old condemned Heresies, though there were never any Heretiques before *Luther*, that held all your Doctrine. I know, your ordinary pretence is to appeal to, and to be judg'd by the *Scripture*: but do you not
first

first make your selves Judges of the Scripture? do you not impose new senses and interpretations on Gods holy Word, such as were never heard of before your *Apostasy*? do you not, against all reason, interpret plain places of Scripture by obscure, rather then the obscure by the plain? and when by your corrupt translations, false glosses, and new interpretations, you have made the Scripture speak what you please, then you cry out, *The Scripture has given sentence for you against the Church of Rome*. I confess, since you have made your selves Masters of the *Holy Ghost*, you were very unwise, if you would not make him speak as you would have him; you have usurped a power, that we dare not challenge; we tremble at that fearful curse denounced by *S. Paul* (*Gal. i.*) against all those that shall teach new Doctrines: We hearken to, not censure the Church: We embrace her doctrine, not charge her with errors. But I would ask any reasonable man (though there were no Obligation, yet) whether it were not more prudential for a man to build his salvation on the authority of the whole Church, then of some particular persons, not altogether agreeing amongst themselves, and disagreeing from the whole world besides; or whether

it

it were not more reasonable to imbrace the doctrines and interpretations of *Scripture*, that were universally receiv'd by the whole Church for 1500. years, then those new doctrines and interpretations of *Luther* and his followers. You confess, that before your *Reformation* (as you call it) you communicated with the Church of *Rome*, How came you to find that the Church wanted a *Reformation*, and that in *Doctrine*? (for in matters of *Discipline* and manners you might have reform'd your selves, and yet still have been in communion with the Church of *Rome*) How came you to discover those errors, which none in the whole Christian world besides yourselves could perceive? before your separation there was no particular branch or member of the *Catholique Church*, but was in communion with the Church of *Rome*, How then came you to see that light, which none besides your selves could see? Was all the world besides you blind? Had you only the *Scriptures*? Or could you only interpret them? But why do I speak of you, as of a company or multitude? For though Time has now made the difference to be between the *Protestants* and the Church of *Rome*, yet originally it was between *Luther* and the whole

whole Church ; you in *England*, as all other *Protestants*, are but *Luthers* followers. The Church then went one way, and *Luther* another; and you very wisely have forsaken the whole Church, and followed *Luther*. Do but examine this according to the principles of common prudence, and then tell me, *Doctor*, whether you have done discreetly. You have forsaken the whole Christian world, and followed one man ; who neither had, nor pretended to any extraordinary calling. He never wrought miracle in confirmation of his new Doctrines; or to manifest to the world that *God* had revealed that Truth unto him, which for many ages had been totally obscur'd, and unknown to the world. It is then your fault now, that you communicate not with the *Catholike Church*, since it was your fault formerly that you forsook her, to follow one man. If you will forsake that single Apostate, and return to your faith and obedience, you shall soon be receiv'd ; the Churches armes are alwayes open to imbrace you.

Before your pretended *Reformation* (according to your own confession, *Scct. 19*) you communicated with *Rome*; that is, you acknowledged your subjection to the *Apostolike Sea of Rome*. You confest the *Bishop* thereof to be the supream visible

Head of Christs Church, appointed by Christ himself to be so; as *St. Peters* successor. For no particular Church, or person, ever was, or could be in communion with the Church of *Rome*, that denied, or questioned this Doctrine, or that refused to yeeld obedience to the *Sea of Rome*, as the *Head and Mother* of all Churches, and to the Bishop thereof as Christs *Vicar General* on Earth. How then came you (in *England*) to find out that at last, which your *Ancestors* for almost 1000. years could not discover? They all even from the first conversion of this Nation to the *Christian Faith*, by *St. Augustine*, to *K. Hen. eights Defection*, were subject to the *Sea of Rome*, and to the Bishop thereof, as Christs immediate *Vicar*, and under him, the supreme head of the *Catholike Church*. How come you to be wiser then all your fore-fathers, and the whole world besides? Can it be reasonably supposed, that those great *Patriarchs* of the *East*, the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, of *Hierusalem*, of *Antiech*, &c. with all the Bishops of *Asia*, *Africa* and *Europe*, should profess and acknowledge themselves subject to the Bishop of *Rome*, had they not thought, that his power and Jurisdiction over the whole *Catholique Church* had been by Christs especial ap-

appointment and commission? What colourable plea then can you alleadge for your separation?

31. But I perceive the *Doctor* is flying to his old fallacy, in taking for granted, or rather indeed downright begging, that the Church of *Rome* can be no more then a particular branch or member of the Church *Catholique*. For his words immediarly following are these. (*And yet we shall man- gre Satan communicate with the Catho- lique Church; while with one minde and mouth we glorifie God, &c.*) Good *Doctor*, deceive not your self, the *Devil* doe's but laugh at you for that idle fancy. You cannot truly glorifie *God* either in minde or mouth, whilest you separate your selves from Gods Church. Neither can you communicate with the *Catholique Church*, whilest you keep your selves out of the communion of the Church of *Rome*. I told you before *Señ. 2.* that the *Roman Church*, and the *Catholique Church* are in some sense *Synonymaes*, signifying one and the same thing. The Church of *Rome* is that *Casbo- like Church*, out of whose communion who- soever dyes, shall never see the face of *God*.

Now in what sense the *Roman Church* is called the *Catholique Church*, though I have already shewed you, yet I will here

somewhat farther explain it.

The *Catholique Church* may be considered ; First, in respect of her *Faith* and *Doctrinc* ; Secondly, in respect of her *Government* or *Discipline*.

According to the first consideration, all true particular Churches and Christians, professing and united in one and the same *Faith* and *Communion*, are truly and properly called, the *Catholique Church* ; and this is formally the *Church Catholique*. We say not, that the *Roman Church* is thus ; that is, formally *Catholique* : She is in this sense a part, or member only of the *Catholique Church*. But if we consider the *Catholique Church* in respect of her *Government*, then the *Church of Rome* may truly and properly be called *Catholique* ; though not formally, yet causally ; because she being the *Mother* and *Head* of all other particular Churches of the Christian world, in right of her *Bishop*, who is *St. Peters* successor, and appointed by *Christ* to be the *supream Head* and *Governor* of his whole Church, is the fountain and centre of *Unity*, which she infuses into the whole *Catholique Church* ; causing all the particular members thereof to be united in one and the same *supream earthly Head* and *Governor*. Those then that submit themselves

selves to the *Apostolique Sea* of Rome, and are in communion with the Bishop thereof, by subjecting themselves to his Authority and Government, acknowledging him *Christs Vicar* on earth, & the sole supream Head of his Church, may most properly be termed, *Roman Catholiques*.

The Province of *Canterbury* consisted of many particular Churches, or *Episcopal Seas*, all united in the Church or Sea of *Canterbury*, which gave denomination to the whole Province. *Canterbury* it self was not the whole Province; but because it was the *Metropolitan Sea*, the Head and Mother-Church of the whole Province, wherein all the particular Seas of that Province were united, and to whom they yeilded obedience; the whole Province received its Denomination from her: which notwithstanding, being considered as a particular Church or Diocese, was but a part or member of the Province of *Canterbury*. So likewise the Church of Rome being the *Metropolitan Sea* of the whole world, the Head and Mother-Church of the Christian world, wherein all particular Seas and Churches whatsoever, that are in communion with the *Church Catholique*, are united; every true Church in particular, may be said to be within the universal Province,

or Church of Rome. And the *Roman Church* (comprehending under her all particular Churches whatsoever, that are branches and members of the *Catholique*, to whom they all owe obedience and subjection, and in whom they are all united, as in the grand *Metropolitan Church* of the *Christian world*) may properly be styled the *Catholique Church*.

As then there was the particular Sea, or Church of *Canterbury*, and the whole Province of *Canterbury*; so also, there is the particular Sea, or Church of *Rome*, and the universal Church of *Rome*. And as the particular Sea of *Canterbury*, was a part of the Province of *Canterbury*; so likewise the particular Church of *Rome*, is but a part of the universal, or *Catholique Church* of *Rome*: the Church of *Rome*, as truly comprehending all particular Churches of the *Christian world*; as the Province of *Canterbury* contained all the particular Seas of that Province. In brief, as the Sea of *Canterbury* was to all the particular Seas of that Province; so is the Church of *Rome* to all the particular Churches of the whole world.

And by this you may perceive how frivolous that trivial objection is, which has been so often made against that expression

sion, [*Roman Catholique*] as if those words implied a contradiction, in signifying *Particular*, and yet *Universal*.

32. And that the *Roman Church* has ever bin in this sense, the *Catholique Church*, viz. as being the *Head and Mother-Church* of all other *Christian Churches*, appears as plainly as any other point of Faith or Doctrine whatsoever.

Neither the *Scriptures* themselves, nor any Doctrine or Article of Faith, written, or unwritten, has descended unto us by a more full and ample Tradition, then this Doctrine of the *Primacy* of the *Apostolick See of Rome*, and *Supremacy* of the Bishop thereof over all Churches. So that he that shall deny or question this, may as well doubt of the *Scriptures*, and consequently of Christs coming in the flesh, and dying for the sins of the world. Are not the writings of the *Ancient Fathers* full of it? has not the universal practise of the Church in all ages made it shine bright, even at this day to the world? Read the *Fathers*, examine the *Councils*, view the practise of Gods Church in all ages, and you will soon confess this to be an apparent and unquestionable Truth. Besides, consider that the *Primacy* and authority of *St. Peter*, and his Successors, the Bishops of *Rome*, as

it has been a Doctrin universally receiv'd, so has it no known beginning since the time of the *Apostles*; and therefore according to the principles of common Reason, we ought to imbrace it as an *Apostolical Tradition*. Were not all the churches in the world formerly united and subject to the Sea of Rome? Does it not plainly appear in antient Records and Histories, when the Eastern churches first separated from her communion, and denied obedience to the Bishop of Rome? Is it not apparent when, and how often those pretended churches have been reconcil'd to the *Roman Catholique Church*? Have not the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* themselves profess and acknowledg'd their obedience and subjection to the Bishop of Rome, as *S. Peters Successor*, and *Supreme Head of Christs Church*? Was there ever any Society of men professing the name of Christ, and divided from the Church of Rome, that did not first separate themselves from her communion?

He then that is no *Roman Catholique*, is none at all, since by his Schisme he has cut himself off from the communion of the *Catholique Church*, and to justifie his Schisme, he must necessarily fall into Heresie, by denying this Doctrin of Faith, viz
That

That the *Roman Church* is the Mother and Head of all churches, and the Bishop thereof appointed by Christ, as *S. Peters* Successor, to be the Supreme Pastor and Governour of his *Catholique Church*.

I know you will deny this to be a Doctrine of Faith, but you must then condemn the *Fathers* that taught it, the *Councils* that declar'd it; The learned *Fathers* of the Church (*S. Irenaeus* li. 3. c. 3.) *S. Hierome* *Epist.* 57. *S. Cyprian* de *Unitat. Eccles.* *S. Basil* concion. de penitent. *S. Leo*, *Serm.* 1. in *Natal. Apostolor. Petr. & Paul.* *Gelasius.* in decret. cum 70. *Episcopis.* *S. Augustin.* *Epist.* 92. as also the reverend Pastors of the church assembled in divers *General Councils*: In the first *General Council* of *Nice*, *Can.* 6. in the *Council* of *Ephesus*, *Act.* 3. in the *Council* of *Calcedon*, *Act.* 16. and in the *Epistle*, or *relation* sent to *Pope Leo* from the whole *Council*; in the *Council* at *Sardis*, *Can.* 3. could plainly see this Doctrine in *Scripture*, and so might you too, if you would but open your eyes, and not onely there, but in the *Universal Tradition* and *practise* of the church. This Doctrine was receiv'd by the church of *England* for almost a 1000. years together, without interruption; How then come you to be wiser
then

then all your Forefathers for so many ages? You receiv'd the *Scriptures* from them, and to think that they could not interpret them as well as you, is excessive pride, and insolent madness.

A world of testimonies might be brought in confirmation of this Doctrine, but it has been already so fully, and so often prov'd by many learned Catholics, that it may be altogether unnecessary for me to add any further proofs, especially since my intention is to contain my selfe within the bounds of a short Reply.

Wherefore the pretended *Greek Church* (though it abhor and deest your new Doctrines, as damnable and Heretical, as appears evidently by the book entituled [*Jeremie Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani, sententia definitiva de Doctrina & Religione Wittenbergensium Theologorum, &c.*] An. 1586.) is now no church at all, as neither are you, but a dead branch lop'd off by Schisme and Heresie from the Tree of Life, a corrupt member cut off from Christs mystical body.

33. But to justify this your Schism, you alledg certain *Canons* of the churches, which assure you, that every *Provincial Synod*, is to order all things within the *Province*.

Ans.

Ans. If you mean by [*All things*] all things amiss in matters concerning manners and Discipline, I can easily grant it; but this will not satisfie you. *The Church* (you say) *did usually reform, both in manners and faith, by Diocesan, and Provincial Councils.*

Ans. I confess the Pope has confirm'd the Acts and Decrees of divers *Provincial Councils*, even concerning matters of Faith, as when they have condemn'd some apparent and notorious Heresie, and anathematiz'd such Heretiques as have oppos'd, either a Doctrine universally known, and receiv'd by the whole church, or els some Declaration and Definition of a former General Council: and this is all that you can gather, either out of the *African Code*, or the canons of any Council, either General or Provincial.

As for the *Code of the universal Church*, by you cited, you must know Doctor, that it was compiled by Schismatiques and Heretiques, who to diminish and derogate from the just Rights and Prerogatives of the Bishop of Rome, have apparently falsified divers canons of the Council of *Sardis*.

But that General Doctrines universally receiv'd and taught by the whole Catho-
lique

lique Church, as Doctrines descending by *Universal Tradition* from *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and declar'd to be such by *General Councils*; should be censur'd and condemn'd, first by one single person, and afterwards by those only that followed him in his *Apostasie* and *Herésie*, for damnable errors must necessarily appear to any reasonable and impartial spirit, not onely most unreasonable and temerarious, but sacrilegious and damnable; yet this you have done, charging the whole world with gross and damnable errors, and alledging Scripture to prove them so, to which you appeal to justify your *Apostasie*, making your selves the sole *Juages* and *Interpreters* thereof.

34. But I meet with a testimony of *S. Hilary* of *Poitteurs*, to prove, that *Rome* was once not only distinct from, but not so much as a part of the *Catholique Church*, his words cited are these: *Quidam ex vobis firmissima fidei constantia intra communionem se meam continentes; se à cæteris extra Gallias abstinerunt.* And hence you conclude, that the Church of *France* at that time communicated not with *Rome*, unless we can prove *Rome* to be in *France*.

Ans. This is much like your former consequences: *S. Hilary* was not so simple

as to think the whole *Catholique Church* was at that time confin'd to one Country or Nation; he only commended the constancy of his Countrymen, in persevering in the *Catholique Faith*, and not communicating with the *Arrians*; which swarm'd in divers places out of *France*. If then by those words [*ceteris extra Gallias*] you would exclude all the world, besides *France*, from the *Catholique Church*, you will but make your self ridiculous to the world, in making that great Pillar of the *Gallican Church* speak that, which all the world knows to be false; for at that time, neither the Church of *Rome*, nor any *Western Church* was infected with *Arrianism*, as appears plainly by *S. Basil*, who was *S. Hilary's* Cretanean, and a Bishop in the *Eastern Church*, viz. of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*; his words are these, *Vos par erat intelligere, quod per Dei gratiam quamplurimi sint, qui fidem timentur Orthodoxam à Patribus Nicænis secundum pietatis regulam traditam; neq; vos per Orientem solis suis relictis; at verò universus quidem Occidens vobiscum unanimiter & nobiscum conspirat. Basil Epist. 193.* Here you see the whole *Western Church* vindicated from that *Heresie*, which doubtless *S. Hilary* well knew: Those then in *France* that retain'd
their

their antient Faith, kept themselves within the communion of the Roman *Catholique Church*, from whose communion never yet any separated, but *Schismaticques* and *Heretiques*

34. The next *Father* of the Church that I meet with is *Arch-bishop Laud* (as you are pleas'd to call him) whose authority you have often cited, which I cannot but wonder at, since he was so far from being a *Father*, that he neither liv'd nor died a *Son* of the Church; but the *Doctor*, out of that pretended *Arch-bishops* book, charges the Church of *Rome* with four opinions repugnant to the plain words of *Scripture*, viz. 1. *Transubstantiation*. 2. *Admiration of the blessed Sacrament to the Laity in one kind*. 3. *Invocation of Saints*. 4. *Adoration of Images*.

Answer. Though it be not much pertinent to our present purpose to examine these *Doctrines* according to *Scripture*; since the *Doctor* confesses that the Church of *Rome*, notwithstanding her errors, is a true Church, and a member of the one *Catholique*, *Sect.* 12. yet because he believes the Church of *Rome* is justly charged with these unsound and un-*Catholique* *Doctrines* (as he is pleas'd to call them) I could not pass them by; but shall endeavour as briefly

as may be to vindicate the Church of Rome from that foul and false *calumnies*.

35 First then, *Transubstantiation* (according to the *Roman Catholike Do&rine*) is a true and real change of the total substance of Bread and Wine, after, and by virtue of the words of *Consecration* pronounc't by the *Priest*, into the true, real, and substantial Body and Blood of Christ. Let us now examine how this *Do&rine* is repugnant to the plain words of *Scripture*.

Our blessed *Saviour* saith, Matth. 26. 26 and Mar. 14. 22. *This is my Body*; and, *This is my Blood*. The words are plain, and being taken literally, must necessarily import a change. For that which was before *Bread and Wine*, after our *Saviours* consecration, is, (according to the proper and literal sense of the words) the very *Body and Blood of Christ*. Where is then the *Repugnancy* between this *Do&rine* and the plain words of *Scripture*? Christ sayes of that which was *Bread and Wine*; *This is my Body*; and, *This is my Blood*. The Church of Rome sayes so too. Instead then of a *Repugnancy*, here is a full consent and agreement between the plain words of our *Saviour*, and the *Do&rine* of the Church of Rome. Well, but the words are not to
be

be taken *literally*, but *figuratively*. Be it so. Then is this Doctrine of the Church of Rome repugnant (at the most) but to the *figurative* sense, not to the *plain words*, or *literal* sense of *Scripture*. But to come closer; If the Doctor can produce any one Text of *Scripture*, that shall be but halfe as plain for the *Metaphorical* or *figurative* sense, or that the Creatures of *Bread* and *Wine*, are not really and substantially changed into the very *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* after *Consecration*, but retain their former nature and substance of *Bread* and *Wine*, as these words of *Christ* are for such a change; I will then (for my part) give the cause, and turn *Protestant* too, or any thing else that Doctor *Bowden* shall command me to be. But if he cannot produce any such Text (as most certainly he cannot) then is the Doctrine of the *Protestants*, and not that of the Church of Rome, repugnant to the plain words of *Scripture*.

36 But to justify your selves, and to avoid the *Catholike Doctrine* of the *real presence* and *Transubstantiation*, you thus interpret those words; *This is my Body, &c. viz. This is a signe or figure of my Body:* but what *Scripture* have you for it? What authority? What *Catholique Father*,
what

what *Council* did ever give that Interpretation of those words? I confess, if there be no true and real change of *Bread* and *Wine* into the substance of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* in the blessed *Sacrament*, then will I also admit of that interpretation. For if there be no such change, then of necessity those creatures of *Bread* and *Wine* can be but bare signes and figures onely of *Christs Body* and *Blood*. But behold *Gods Providence* over his *Church*. The *Holy Ghost* fore-seeing the evasions and shifts that some men would use to delude the world, and to poison the *Church* with their *Heretical Doctrines*, in opposition to *Gods sacred Truth*, has in *St. Lukes Gospel*, 22. 19, 20 utterly cut you off even from that very glosse and interpretation. The words of the *Evangelist*, are these.

Τὸ ἐστὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τοῦ αἱματί μου τὸ ὅπερ ὑμῶν ἐκχωσάμενον.

This is the Cup of the new Testament in my blood, which (Cup) is shed for you. These are the words in the *Original Language* of *St. Lukes Gospel*. And though both in the *Latin* and *English* translation the Relative [*which*] may seem to refer to [*Blood*] as well as to (Cup) yet in the *Greek* it is very plain, that it must refer to (Cup.) If
then

then that which was contain'd in the cup, was that which was shed for the sins of the world, how could it be Wine, or a sign or figure only of *Christs* blood, or any thing else, but the true and real blood of *Christ*? For no *sign* or *figure* of blood, but *Christs* true and real precious blood was shed for the sins of the world. I will endeavour to make this Doctrine appear more plaine by this Syllogism.

That which was shed for the sins of the world, was the true and real precious blood of *Christ*.

But that which was in the cup was that which was shed for the sins of the world. *Ergo*.

That which was in the cup was the true and real precious blood of *Christ*.

The *Major Proposition* cannot be denied without blasphemy, the *Minor* is most plain by the words of the *Text*; and therefore the *conclusion* must necessarily follow. Here is no *Fallacy Doctor*, in this *Syllogism*, no more terms then ought to be in a *Syllogism*, but to utterly debar you of your *sign* or *figure*, I argue thus:

That which was shed for the sins of the world, was not a sign or figure only of *Christs* blood.

But that which was in the Cup was shed for

for the sins of the world. *Ergo.*

That which was in the Cup was not a sign or figure only of Christ's blood.

Those words then, *Τὸ ὅτι τὸ πο-
τήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν αἵματι μου.*
*This is the Cup, the New Testament in my
Blood*, cannot admit of this interpretati-
on; *This Cup is a sign of my Blood*; unless
you will grant that a bare sign of Christ's
blood was shed for the sins of the world,
which is high blasphemy. For it is very
plain by the express words of the Text,
That the very Cup which was the *New Te-
stament in Christ's Blood*, was shed for the
sins of the world; wherefore that Cup could
not be a sign onely, but the true precious
blood of our Saviour.

What say you Doctor? who now main-
tains *Doctrines repugnant to plain words
of Scripture?* you, or the Church of Rome?
you will say, perchance, that those words
τὸ ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἐκχωρηθῆναι were for-
merly but *Marginal Note*, and are now
crept into the Text, and that all the *Greek
copies* of *S. Lukes Gospel* are corrupted.
This indeed is the answer that one of your
great and learned Reformers, *Beza*, has
given, though without any ground, or co-
lourable

lourable proof: but he well knew, that the words of the *Text* were so plain, that they could not admit of any other shift or evasion; and by this shift you may evade any authority of *Scripture* that may be brought against you; and (had truth no other way to defend it self) we also might thus answer any text of *Scripture*, that can be alledged against any Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

37. But let us now see what the antient Fathers say concerning this fond Doctrine, and repugnant to the plain words of *Scripture*.

S. Chrysostome speaking of Christ's presence in the blessed Sacrament, has these words; *Ecce eum vides, ipsum tangis, ipsum manducas. Et tu quidem vestimenta capis videre. Ipse vero tibi concedit, non tantum videre, verum & manducare, & tangere, & intrare sumere.* Hom. 60. ad Pop. Antiochen. Behold thou seest him (Christ) thou touchest him, thou catest him, thou desirest to see his garments, and he is pleas'd that thou shouldest not only see him, but also eat him, touch him, and receive him within thy body. And that this seeing, eating, touching and receiving Christ, is not in a bare figure only, appears plainly by these words of the Father

ther following in the same Homily; *Quod Angeli videntes horrescunt, neq; libere audent insueri propter emicantem inde splendorem, hoc nos pascimur.* That which the Angels tremble to behold, and scarce dare presume to look upon, by reason of its glorious splendor, even this do we feed on. Mark this good Doctor; Angels tremble not at such mean creatures as Bread and Wine, neither have these creatures as bare signs only of Christs body and blood, such glorious lustre and splendor: Indeed Christs true body, which good Catholics feed on, is a glorious body, ten thousand times more glorious then the Sun, though the glory thereof, as being a spiritual body, cannot appear to mortal eyes.

And that you may not fly to your other shift, and say, that we receive and feed on Christs body by Faith and love only, hear what the same Father sayes in the same Homily, a little before the last words cited; *Neq; enim illi satis fuit hominem fieri, colaphis cadi, & crucifigi, verum ut semetipsum nobis commiscet, & nos fide tantum, verum & ipsa re, nos suum efficit corpus.* He (Christ) was not onely contented to become man, to be buffeted and crucified, but he also incorporates himselfe into us, and makes us to be
 his

his own body, not by Faith only, but truly and really. And (Hom. 61. ad Pop. Antio.) the same Father thus saith; *Unum corpus efficiamur &c. Ut itaq; non tantum per charitatem hoc fiamus, verum etiam ipsare, in illam misceamur carnem; hoc namq; per escam efficitur quam largitus est nobis. We are become one and the same body [with Christ, viz by the power of the blessed Sacrament] I ha then we may be sa not by charity only, but truly and really let us be incorporated into that flesh, for this is brought to pass by that food which he has given us. And now Doctor, how is it possible that Bread and Wine should incorporare us into Christ's flesh; or that bare figures should make us become one body with him, and that not only spiritually and mystically, but truly and really? But let us hear the same Father speak once more; (Hom. 60. ad Pop. Antioch.) *Nos Ministrorum tenemus locum, qui verò sanctificat ea & immutat ipse est. We supply the place of Ministers, but he that sanctifies and changes them is (Christ) himself. Here is a change, and that by the power of Christ, not then by the Faith of the communicant.**

38. Let us now hear what S. Ambrose sayes,

says, (de Sacram. li. 4. c. 4.) *Panis iste panis est ante verba Sacramentorum; ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi; quomodo potest qui panis est corpus esse Christi? Consecratione.* Before the words of Consecration it is bread; as soon as Consecration comes, of bread, it is made the flesh of Christ. (Mark those words. *De pane, of, or from bread*) How can that which is bread, become the Body of Christ? by consecration. And a little after, *Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent esse quæ non erant, quanto magis operatorius est, ut quæ erant, in aliud commutentur?* If then there be so great power in the word of our Lord Jesus, that those things which had no being, should begin to have a being; how much rather does it effect, that those things which had a being, should be chang'd into an other substance? Here then is a change, a substantial or essential change, as appears plainly by those words (*in aliud commutentur*) (And what does a substantial or an essential change differ from Transubstantiation?) and this change is wrought principally by Christs omnipotent power, instrumentally by the words of Consecration pronounc'd by the Priest; then doubtless, not by the faith and charity of the communicant.

39. Some of your Sect I know have been very forward to acknowledg *Christ* truly and really present in the *blessed Sacrament*; nay, that *Christs* body is really present there, but how? by faith; but what you mean by that expression, [*by Faith*] I know not; howbeit I am sure you must understand either the manner, or the means of *Christs* body being really present there: If by those words you understand the manner of *Christs* body being present in the *Sacrament*, then is his body present there *apprehensively* only; for by Faith the soul apprehends *Christs* body, which in that apprehension is spiritually present to the faithful and worthy communicant; but how then can this be clear'd from a contradiction? for to be present *apprehensively* only by *faith*, is contradicting with being truly and really present; so that to say, *Christs* body is truly and really in the *blessed Sacrament* by *faith*, is in effect to say, *Christs* body is truly and really in the *Sacrament*, and, *Christs* body is not truly and really in the *Sacrament*.

And if by *Faith* you understand the means, that is, either the *meritorious* (pardon that word) or *instrumental* cause of *Christs* body being really present in the *Sacrament*, or a necessary condition, without

out which Christ's body cannot be really present there: then first you contradict the forecited Fathers, who say, that Christ's body is really present in the Sacrament by the omnipotent power of Christ in the words of *Consecration* pronounc'd by the Priest. Secondly, this *real presence* of Christ's body, must be either by a change of one substance into another, and so consequently by that which the Church calls *Transubstantiation*; (and then you will not accuse that Doctrine for being *repugnant to the plain words of Scripture*) or else by consubstantiation; and then why do you not adore it? and why do you charge the Church of Rome with Idolatry for adoring Christ wheresoever he is corporally present, since his Humanity is inseparably and *Hypostatically* united to his Divinity.

40. Let us now hear what Eusebius Emisissenus sayes, *Invisibilis sacerdos visibiles creaturas in substantiam corporis & sanguinis sui, verbo suo secretâ potestate convertit*: These words are cited out of the Author by Gratian. (*de consecrat. dist. 2. c. quia corpus.*) The invisible Priest (Christ) converts the visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood by his word, by his secret power. How can Transubstantiation be more plainly express'd, then in these words? Or what is Transubstantiation

substantiation, but a change of creatures into another substance? Many more testimonies might be brought both from the antient and modern *Fathers* in confirmation of this Doctrine, which to avoid prolixity I have omitted.

41. This Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* being proved (as it hath been both by *Scripture* and *Fathers*) is a sufficient justification of the *administration* of the *blessed Sacrament* to the *Laity* in one kind, (the blessed Sacrament being integrally as well as essentially contain'd under either kind) which is the second Doctrine repugnant (as you say) to the plain words of *Scripture*. But where is it said in *Scripture*, *You shall not administer the blessed Sacrament to the Laity in one kind onely?* Or where is it said; *You shall administer the blessed Sacrament to the Laity under both kinds?* If any such precept be contain'd in plain words of *Scripture*, why has it never yet been discovered? and if there be no such plain precept there, then the *administration* of the blessed *Sacrament* to the *Laity* in one kind, cannot be repugnant to plain words of *Scripture*; the unlawfulness thereof can be but (at the most) deducible from some places of the *Scripture*; which being obscure and ambiguous,

guous, cannot be better interpreted then by the antient and universal practise of the church, which in former ages esteemed the administration of the blessed Sacrament to the Laity, under one or both kinds, a thing indifferent, and upon several occasions practised both; as when the *Manichees* abstaining from wine, as a thing unlawful, condemned the use of the *Chalice* in the blessed Sacrament, divers *Catholique Bishops* in opposition to those *Heretiques*, commended the practise of communicating under both kinds: and afterwards, when this error was exploded, and a contrary succeeded, viz. an opinion of certain *Heretiques*; who maintain'd the necessity of communicating under both kinds, because (as they said) Christ was not wholly and entirely contain'd under either: Then the church to prevent a farther Schism, declared the lawfulness and sufficiency of communicating in one kind only, and did withall forbid the administration of the blessed Sacrament under both. The indifferency of communicating in one or both kinds, and the antient practise of the church in relation therunto, I have elsewhere shown, Sect. 20 wherefore here I will only add those words of our blessed *Saviour* in confirmation thereof, Jo. 6. 59. *He that eateth this*

bread shall live for ever. If then the end of the institution of the blessed Sacrament, which is *eternal life*, may be obtain'd by eating only the *body* of Christ; it cannot be necessary for salvation to communicate in both kinds, since Salvation may be obtain'd by communicating under the *Species* of Bread only; and these words are a plain exposition of those words precedent, so often alledg'd against the Church of Rome by Heretiques, *Jo. 6. 54. Unless ye shall eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you: whereby* it appears that the conjunctive [*And*] is to be taken disjunctively for [*Or*] as it is in those words of the *Apostle*, *Act. 3. 6. Silver and gold have I none; where the sense is, Silver or gold have I none.*

Besides, Christs body and blood being entirely contain'd under either *Species*, whosoever receives his body, must also receive his blood: and since *Blood* is properly the subject of drinking, not of eating, he that any way receives Christs blood, may be said to drink it, drinking being as properly refer'd to the *subject*, as to the *action*: Wherefore though that word [*And*] were to be taken conjunctively (as it is not) yet were it sufficient to communicate under one *Species* only; because whosoever
eats

eats Christs body, must also necessarily drink his blood.

Those other Texts so much urged by Protestants, Mat. 26. 27. *Drink ye all of this*: And Luc. 22. 19. *Do this in remembrance of me*, are very impertinent; those words being spoken to the *Apostles* only, and to them as *Priests* and *Bishops*, not in relation to the *Sacrament* only, but to the *Sacrifice*, which the *Apostles* and their Successors, the *Priests*, were to offer up for a continual commemoration of *Christs Passion*. Besides, it is to be observ'd, that our blessed Saviour used not those words absolutely, [*Do this in remembrance of me*] but only when he gave his *Body* under the Species of *Bread*; and when he administered the *Cup*, then he used them conditionally; *Do this, as often as ye shall drink, in remembrance of me.*

42. The third fond Doctrine, and repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, is, invocation of Saints. But where are those plain words of Scripture? I have read the Old and New Testament, yet never could find any such precept as this, *Thou shalt not, or, no man shall invoke Saints. Or, Thou shalt not desire the Saints to offer up thy prayers to God. Or, Thou shalt not pray to the Saints to pray for thee*; and if no

D 3

such

such precept can be found in Scripture, in plain terms (as never any such was yet discovered there) then doubtless this Doctrine is not repugnant to the plain words of Scripture. But on the contrary, I find this Doctrine, viz. *That the blessed Saints may be invocated*, very probably (if not necessarily) deducible from Scripture. For if *Angels* may be invocated, why may not *Saints*, who see God as well as the *Angels*, and are in the same state of bliss and glory with those blessed Spirits? but that the *Angels* may be invocated, is most plain in divers places of Scripture. As from the examples of *Abraham*, Gen. 18. who in that one chapter prayed six times to the *Angel*: Of *Lot*, Gen. 19. Of *Jacob*, Gen. 32. and Gen. 48. 15. where *Jacob* blessing the sons of *Joseph*, after he had invocated his *Angel Guardian*, useth these words, *And let my name, and the name of my Fathers, Abraham and Isaac be invocated on them.* Which words are far more plain for *Invocation of Saints*, then any place of Scripture that you or any other can alledg, can make against it.

And I desire you to take *S. Augustines* observation along with you upon those words, *Unde notandum est* (saith he) *non solum exauditionem, sed & invocationem dici*

dici aliquando, quæ non Dei, sed hominum sunt. Aug. in Gen. 10. 3. Hence we may observe, that sometimes, not only hearing, but Invocation also is spoken of, as not belonging to God (only) but to men. So likewise from the example of Moses, (Ex. 32.) where the Angel of God appeared to him in a flaming bush, S. Stephen himself interpreting it so, Act. 7. 30. Of Gedeon, Judg. 11. 6. Of Iosuah, Ios. 5. 15. who prostrate adored an Angel, knowing him to be an Angel. Of S. John, Rev. 19. and Rev. 22. which places some of you have most ridiculously alledged against this Doctrine of Invocation of Saints and Angels. For that blessed Apostle S. John, either knew him to be an Angel, or not; if he knew him not to be an Angel, then he mistook the Angel for Christ, as probably he might, because the Angel spake in the person of Christ, saying; I am Alpha and Omega, &c. and then the Apostle might offer to adore him with divine worship, which the Angel discovering himself to be but an Angel, might justly reprove: and this interpretation S. Augustine gives of it, q. 61. in Gen. Or else S. John knew him to be but an Angel, and if so, then it cannot be reasonably suppos'd, that the blessed Apostle could sin in worshipping the

Angel; because he having receiv'd the *Holy Ghost*, as well as the rest of the *Apostles*, and being so dear to our blessed *Saviour*, insomuch that he is stiled beyond all the rest of the *Apostles*, *The beloved Disciple*, *Jo. 16. 23.* could not but know, even as the *Angel* himself, what worship was due to God, and what to an *Angel*. Besides, if *S. Iohn's* adoration of the *Angel* had been reprov'd by the *Angel*, as in it self simply unlawful; can it be imagined that so great an *Apostle*, so great a Prophet and Evangelist, would a second time fall into the same error? If then upon a mistake the *Apostle* adored the *Angel* for God, those words of the *Angel* may be a prohibition, or rebuke, otherwise it was but a modest refusal of the *Angel*, who seeing how dear *S. Iohn* was to Christ, and what secret and sublime mysteries had been reveal'd unto him, more then to any of the other *Apostles*, plainly foresaw that the blessed *Apostle* should one day be exalted to an higher degree of glory in heaven, and should be neerer to God then the *Angel* himself; so that, in brief, besides the lawfulness of adoring *Angels* (and consequently Saints) there is nothing else from this place observable, but *S. Iohn's* humility in adoring the *Angel*, and the *Angels* modesty in refusing the adoration.

If then *Abraham, Lot, Iacob, Iosuah, Gedeon*, and *S. Iohn* that great *Apostle*, and beloved *Disciple*, might lawfully adore and invoke *Angels*, why may not we invoke the blessed *Saints*, who together with the *Angels*, see and praise God continually? why may not we desire the assistance of their prayers to God for us?

43. But perchance this *Invocation of Saints* is some new upstart *Doctrine*, lately invented, and brought in by the *Church of Rome*. *Ans.* As new as it is, if either you, *Doctr*, or any *Protestant* in the world, can shew but as much *Antiquity* for your *Religion*, as I can for this *Doctrine*, I will then shake hands with you, and become a *Protestant* my self.

Let us then look back towards the *Primitive times*, and examine the ancient *Doctrine* and practise of the *Church*. *Theodoret*, who lived *An. Christi* 430. proves this *Doctrine* by the general practise of the *Church* in his time; *Qui in peregrinationem aliquam mittuntur* (saith he) *petunt instanter hos (sanctos Martyres) fieri via comites, & duces itineris; qui reditum nanciscuntur afferunt confessionem gratiae, non ut Deos ipsos aduentes, sed ut homines divinos orantes, & intercessores pro ipsis fieri postulantes, Serm. 8. de curand. Græcor. affectionib. (five) de Martyribus.*

tyribus. Those that undertake any journey earnestly, desire them (the holy Martyrs) to accompany and guide them in their journey, and those that return in safety, offer up an acknowledgment of their favours, making their addresses unto them, not as Gods, but praying unto them as Divine men, and beseeching them to become intercessors for them.

Let us hear Cyril of Alexandria speaking in the Council of Ephesus, held An. 431. where himself was Pope Celestines Delegate; *Salve à nobis Deipara Maria, per quam pretiosa Crux celebratur, & adoratur universo orbe. Hail, O Mary, Mother of God, by whom the precious Cross is reverenc'd, and ador'd throughout the whole world.* Let us hear S. Basil (Epist. 205. ad Iulian Apost.) who lived in the yeare of Christ 370. *Sanctos Apostolos Prophetas, & Martyres invoco, ut apud Deum supplicent, & characteres imaginum ipsorum honoro & veneror his traditis à sanctis Apostolis. I invoke the holy Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, that they may pray to God (for us) I honor and reverence their Images; these things being delivered unto us by the holy Apostles.* Here we find that almost 1300. years since, this Doctrine of Invocation of Saints, and honour.

honouring their Images, was receiv'd by the Church as an *Apostolical Tradition*: and *Calvin* himself (*Instit. li. 3. c. 20. n. 22.* speaking of the third Council of *Carthage*, whereat *S. Augustine* was present, acknowledges, that at that time *Invocation of Saints* was practis'd by the Church. *Ea tempestate* (saith he) *moris erat dicere; sancta Maria, aut, sancte Petre, ora pro nobis.* At that time it was a custome to say, *Saint Mary, or Saint Peter, pray for us.*

S. Hierom (*Tom. 1. p. 4. 59. edit. Paris. and To. p. 122. edit. Basilienf.*) and *S. Ambrose li. de viduis*, deduce and prove this Doctrine out of Scripture; and certainly these holy and reverend *Fathers* could interpret Scripture as well as *Iohn Calvin*. Neither is it imagineable, that either these *Fathers*, or *Theodore*, or *S. Basil*, would maintain a Doctrine, and that by Scripture, which should be repugnant to plain words of Scripture.

Besides, that Doctrine which has been confirm'd by the attestation of *Divine Miracles* must be true; but this Doctrine of *Invocation of Saints* has been thus attested, therefore it must be true. The major is proved out of Scripture, *Mar. 6. 20.* and cannot be denied or question'd without blasphemy:

blasphemy: and if you deny the *minor*, you must give *Theodoret* & *S. Augustine* the lye, the former proving it in the forecited place, (*li. 8. de Martyrib.*) the later (*De civitat. Dei li. 22. c. 8.*) where he recounts above a hundred Miracles (of some whereof he was an eye-witness) wrought by God, upon the prayers at the Monument and Reliques of *S. Stephen*; and that prayers were made to the Saints, who also heard and understood the prayers of such as prayed unto them, and the manner how they understand our prayers, and that they grant favours to those that pray unto them, *S. Augustine* will tell you plainly in his 15. and 16. chap. de cur. pro. mors. habend.

Thus is Invocation of Saints vindicated, both from repugnancy to Scripture, and novelty. I come now to the fourth and last fond Doctrine, wherewith the Church of Rome stands charg'd; which is, Adoration of Images.

44. For the better clearing the Church from this charge, I thought it necessary to declare the Doctrine of the Catholique Church concerning Images, which is this, The Images of Christ, of the Mother of God, and other Saints, may be had and kept, and due honour and reverence is to be

be given unto them; as appears by the *Profession of Faith* compos'd and authoriz'd by the Council of *Trent*. Where are the plain words of *Scripture* to which this Doctrine is repugnant? Where is it said in *Scripture*; in plain and express words, *Thou shalt not give any worship, honor, or reverence to the Images of Christ, or of his Mother, or of other Saints?* The *Scripture* in divers places forbids *Divine worship* to be given to *Idols*, or *false Gods*, as *Exod. 20. Levit. 26. Deut. 5. Isay 40. &c.* but where is it said, *Thou shalt not worship, honor, or reverence the holy Images of Christ, or of his Saints?* Those *Texts* of *Scripture* forbid only, that the worship due to *God*, should be given to creatures, *Idols*, or *false Gods*; where then is the repugnancy between the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and plain words of *Scripture*? The *Scripture* forbids *Idolatry*, so does, and ever did the Church of *Rome*. The *Scripture* forbids *Divine worship* to be given to any thing but *God*, so does the Church of *Rome*. *God* forbids *Graven Images*, that is *Idols*, to be set up and adored with *Divine worship*; and the Church of *Rome* commands due honor and reverence to be given to holy *Images of Christ*, and his *Saints*.

I must again demand, where is the repugnancy between this Doctrine of the Church of Rome, and the plain words of Scripture? If you say, that those words *Ex. 20. Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, &c. Thou shalt not fall downe and worship it*, are plain against this Doctrine, I will confess, that they are as plain against it, as any words of Scripture, either of the Old or New Testament; but if you argue from these words, (as many of your Sect have done) that therefore it is not lawfull to honor or reverence the holy Images of Christ, and his Saints; here is then a double fallacy, *A dicto secundum quod, ad dictum simpliciter*. For neither are all Images, but only Idols, nor all worship, but only Divine worship forbidden in those words. I may as well conclude, that because it is said in Scripture, God only is to be worshipt, therefore we must not worship Kings, Princes, and Magistrates. But good Doctor, as there is a Divine worship due to God, and to him only, so there is a civil worship due to Kings, Princes, and Magistrates; and another sort of worship due to Angels and Saints; and so likewise there is a reverence and honor due to the holy Images of Christ and his Saints, not a divine, or absolute, but a certain far inferiour

feriour worship, and meerly relative. Is it a greater sin in me to adore *Christ* in or before his *image*, then it was in *Jacob* to adore *Ioseph* in his *Rod* or *Scepter*? *S. Paul* sayes, (*Heb. 11. 21.*) that *Jacob* adored the top of *Iosephs Rod*: wherein saith *S. Chri-
stost. Hom. 66.* and *Theodoret q. 108.* in *Gen.* *Iosephs* dream was fulfilled, viz. That his Father should worship him. From *Jacob* under the *Old*, let us come to the Fathers under the *New Testament*. You have already heard *S. Basil Epist. ad Iulian, 205.* publikely professing, that he adored the Images of the holy *Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs*; and that this kind of *Adoration of Images*, was an *Apostolical Tradition*. You have heard what *S. Cyril of A-
lexandria* delivered in his Homily before the Council of *Ephesus* (the third General Council) where himself was *President* under Pope *Celestine*; it will not be impertinent to repeat his words, *Hail Mary, mother of God, by whom the precious Cross is reverenc't and adored throughout the whole world.* Here is the Image of the *Holy Cross* adored throughout the whole world (according to *S. Cyril*) in relation to him that died on it: and it is more then probable, that the whole Church then represented in that Council, did praise that

that *Adoration* ; otherwise, doubtless, the Council would have declar'd their dissent from *S. Cyril*, and their dislike of his expression. And now can any reasonable man imagine, that those holy and learned *Fathers*, *S. Basil*, *S. Cyril*, and *S. Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*, should maintain, and the whole Council of *Ephesus* approve of a Doctrine, or practise repugnant to plain words of Scripture ? Besides, it is not as lawful to adore the *Images*, as the *Reliques of Saints* ? and is it not known to all the world with what holy zeale and bitterness *S. Hierome* inveigh's against *Vigilantius*, for opposing and condemning that practise ? Does he not charge *Vigilantius* with *Blasphemy*, for speaking against the *Adoration* of sacred *Reliques* ? Has not God by many apparent *Miracles* approv'd this holy practise ? (*August. de Civit. Dei lib. 22. c. 8.*)

The testimonies that might be brought to confirm this Doctrine, would swell to a large volume. I will only add this, that in the time of the second General Council, it was a custome to adorn Churches with *Images* ; as appears by *S. Gregory Nazianzen*, (*Epist. 49. ad Olympium*) who sat in that Council : as also by this testimony out of *Eusebius*, who sat in the first General Council of *Nice*, held about the year

year of *Christ* 325. that in his time, and long before, Images of *Christ* and his *Apostles* were made and adored, *Hist. Eccles. li. 7. c. 14.* his words are these; *Et nos Apostolorum ipsius (Christi) imagines, Pauli, & Petri, & ipsius etiam Christi vidimus per colores in picturis conservatas, antiquas, ut par est, immutabiliter solitis hoc modo honorare, &c.* We also have seen the Images of *Christ's Apostles*, *Paul*, and *Peter*, as also of *Christ himself*, preserved in *Pictures* by colours, our *Ancestors* being wont, as it is fit, to honor them after this manner.

I pass by the authority of *S. Gregory*, who very learnedly and copiously defends this *Doctrine* (*li. 9. Epist. 9.*) of *Leontinus*, *S. Gregories Cottanean*, Bishop of *Neapolis* in *Cyprus*, who purposely wrote in defence of this *Doctrine*: As also of the second General Council of *Nice*, which defin'd and declar'd this *Doctrine* to be an *Apostolical Tradition*, condemning and anathematizing the *Iconoclasts*, or *Image-breakers*, as *Heretiques*. I omit also the present practise of the pretended *Greek Church*, which you may plainly read in *Jeremias*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*; (*Censura Orient. Eccles. c. 21.*) where he maintains and vindicates this *Doctrine* of honor-

honoring and reverencing Images from superstition and Idolatry, against the *Protestants*. All these I purposely pass by, because I will contain my self within the first five hundred years, to which you have appealed. You see then, *Doctor*, the practise and doctrine of the Church within five hundred years after *Christs birth*, in the Fathers and Councils above-cited. Be now as good as your word, submit to their sentence for trial of the truth of *Religion*, and you will (by Gods grace) soon return to your Mother, the *Roman Catholique Church*.

Thus is that charge, which you say (*Sect. 28.* of your second answer) *We know not how to shift off*, fully answer'd.

45. In the next *Sect. 25.* I meet with some Authorities against the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. The first is of *S. Irenaeus*, who sharply checked and reprov'd Bishop *Victor* for keeping such a stir about the observation of Easter, and excommunicating divers Churches, because they would not stoop to his lure. *Ans.* That Pope *Victor*, who govern'd the Church about 200. years after the birth of our Saviour, excommunicated the Churches of *Asia* for their too much Judaizing in the observati-
on of Easter, is a very strong argument a-
gainst

gainst you. For first, *S. Victor* was a pious and blessed man, and therefore it cannot be reasonably imagin'd, that he would usurp a power which *Christ* never gave him. Secondly, those Churches of *Aſia* never protested against his Jurisdiction over them, which certainly they would have done, had not the Church in those dayes esteemed the Bishop of *Rome* the common Pastor of *Christs Church*, and appointed by *Christ* to be under him, the supreme Head thereof. Thirdly, when *S. Irenæus* expostulated with him for his severity in excommunicating the *Eastern Churches*, he never charged him for transgressing the bounds of his Jurisdiction, or for usurping a power which *Christ* never delegated unto him, which in all probability he would have done, had he not look't on the Bishop of *Rome*, as the supreme visible Head of *Christs Church*. But because he conceiv'd not their offence so hainous, as to deserve so heavy a censure; he therefore took upon him to reprove *Pope Victor*, by way of friendly and fraternal correction, as *S. Paul* sometimes did *S. Peter*; and as *S. Paul* never question'd *S. Peters* Jurisdiction, nor denied him to be the chief and Head of the *Apostles*; so neither did *S. Irenæus*, nor any of the *Eastern Church*, that were excommunicated

municated by Pope *Victor*, question or protest against the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*.

And those words of *S. Cyprian* in the Council of *Carthage*, are to be understood of the *African* Bishops only, who being of equal authority, could not excommunicate one another: They exclude not the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*; otherwise *S. Cyprian* had contradicted himself, who sayes plainly (*Epist. ad Quintinum*, and *Serm. de bon. patient.*) that Christ built his Church upon *S. Peter*: and (*li. 4. ep. 8. ad Cornel.*) that the Unity of the Catholique Church consists in the communion with the Bishop of *Rome*: His words you shall find hereafter. *Señ. 58.*

In the next place *Señ. 26.* enters an angry Bishop of *Cappadocia*, *Firmilianus*, speaking thus to Pope *Stephen*; *Te ipsum excidisti, noli te fallere*, Mistake not thy self, thou Bishop of *Rome*, while thou goest about to cast out others, by this presumption thou hast cast off thy self from the body of Christ, which is his Church. *Ans.* By your leave, Doctor, you misunderstand *Firmilianus*, he speaks not as you would have him. Indeed he was very angry with Pope *Stephen*, because he excommunicated him for maintaining that Heretical Doctrine of

rebaptizing Heretiques: He never told Pope Stephen, that he had cut himself off from the Church, because he excommunicated Firmilianus, or any other Bishop, but he was willing the world should think that Pope Stephen, in defending the Baptism of Heretiques to be lawful, had sided with them in their Heresies, and had therefore cut himself off from the Church, not because he had excommunicated any Heretical Bishop of the East, but because (as Firmilianus conceiv'd) he too much complied with Heretiques. And you know, Doctor, the very same Doctrine, for which Firmilianus was excommunicated, was afterward, in the first General Council of Nice, declar'd to be Heretical.

46. It is common (say you) in these daies, even with those that conscientiously pretend to truth, not to be content with the Rule of Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints, and received from them by the Primitive Church, and so transmitted to posterity; but we have an itching after new inventions, &c. These courses I abhor with a perfect hatred.

Ans. Here Doctor, you have directly given sentence against your self: If you will but examine the Doctrines of the Roman Church, and your Doctrines, wherein you oppose

oppose and differ from her : but according to S. *Augustines* Rule (*de Baptis. li. 2. c. 23.*) and the principles of common reason , you will soon discover which is the Rule of Faith deliver'd to the *Saints* , receiv'd from them by the *Primitive Church* , & so transmitted to posterity ; and which are those *new inventions* : For it is impossible , that either you , or any *Protestant* in the world can shew or prove , that any one *Doctrin* which the *Roman Church* at this day maintains and teaches , had its beginning , or crept into the Church since Christ and his *Apostles* : Whereas on the contrary , there is not one *Doctrin* wherein you differ from the *Roman Church* , but may be , and has been often already prov'd and demonstrated to have begun since the time of the *Apostles*. How then do you abhor with a perfect hatred these courses , since you have imbrac't *new inventions* , and totally forsaken the Rule of Faith delivered to the *Saints* , receiv'd from them by the *Primitive Church* , and transmitted to Posterity ? If it can be clearly demonstrated , that all your *Doctrines* wherein you differ from the *Roman Church* are new ; and if it cannot be proved , that any one *Doctrin* of the *Roman Church* had its beginning since the *Apostles* , either you abhor
not

not these courses with a perfect hatred (as you profess) or else you must in all points embrace the Doctrine of the Roman Church.

47. But stay; Here I meet with a brace of fierce Syllogismes, that fly furiously at the very throat of the poor Church of Rome. The first is this.

That Church which hath erred, is not the Pillar and ground of truth. But The Church of Rome hath erred. Ergo: The Church of Rome is not the Pillar and ground of Truth. The minor is thus prov'd by the second Syllogism.

That Church which hath professed Montanism, Arrianism, Eutychianism, hath erred: But,

The Church of Rome hath professed all these: Ergo, The Church of Rome hath erred.

And this *minor* (you say) you have sufficiently proved Sect. 18. 27. But I have more sufficiently proved, that you have there proved nothing at all, but are forc't to fly to most ridiculous shifts and fallacies; and those fallacies I meet with here again, Sect. 30. where the Church of Rome is charg'd with all sins almost imagineable, and divers Authors are cited to prove that charge. Let us see then how they prove it.

Platina

Platina and *Onuphrius* are produc't to prove, that *Schism* was rais'd there. What then? Was the Church of Rome therefore Schismatical, because some rais'd a Schism there? I told you before, that the Authors only of the Schism, and those that adhere to them are the Schismatiques, they have forsaken the Church, they have cut themselves off from Christs body; the Church it self remains still sound and entire. But that *Stella* and *Almain* should charge the Church of Rome with Heresie, to say no more, is most false. I must once more put you in mind what *Stella* sayes in the place by you cited, Luc. 22. 31. *Ecclesia Antiochena, Alexandrina, & Constantinopolitana saepe defecerunt à fide, Ecclesia verò Romana nunquam defecit.* The Church of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople have often fallen from the Faith, but the Church of Rome never fell from the Faith. Remember these words, and never produce *Stella* more for that purpose. And what if there were many and great sinners in the Church of Rome? what is this to her Faith and Doctrine? What if She wanted Reformation in point of manners and Discipline? what is that to Her belief? What if some Popes have been vicious? was the Church of Rome therefore

fore vicious? and what if some Popes of Rome had fallen from their Faith, must the Church of Rome therefore forsake her Faith?

There was a time (you say, out of *Baronius, An. Christi 903. n. 5. and An. 931. n. 1.*) when Marozia, and her Daughter (a couple of lewd Strumpets) disposed of the Popedom for many years, so that none possessed that Chair, but Boys, Fools, and Knaves. *Ans.* I pray, tell me, Doctor, did the Church of Rome at that time consist only of Boys, Fools, and Knaves? When the Popes were Boys, was there not one man, woman, or child in the whole Church of Rome? Or when they were Fools, or Knaves, were there then no wise or honest men in that Church? These consequences must follow as well as the other. For if it follow, that because some Popes have been vicious, therefore the whole Church of Rome in those daies was also vicious? or because *Marcellinus, Liberius*, and *Io. 22.* denied *Iesus Christ* to be the true God and Eternal Life, therefore in those daies Rome was no Church, but an *Antichristian Synagogue*, as you infer, *Señ. 17.* It follows as necessarily; that because some Popes have been boys, therefore in those times the Church of Rome

consisted only of boys, and that there were neither men, women, nor children in the whole Church: as likewise, because some Popes have been fools and knaves, that therefore at that time there were no wise nor honest men in the Church of Rome. To such miserable and ridiculous shifts are Heretiques driven, whose pride and obstinacy is such, that they will rather damn their own souls, then confess their errors.

47. But by the way, Doctor, I must desire you to observe, that those Popes whom *Bronius* complains of, in the places by you cited, (*An. 908. nu. 5. and An. 931. nu. 1.*) were but *Pseudo-Popes*, not lawfully elected, but intruding into the *Papacy* by the power of the *Marquesses of Tuscany*; his words are these, *Mortuo Stephano potentia Widonis Tusciae Marchionis, & Marozia matris, Sergii Pseudo-Popæ ex dicto scorto Marozia filius, &c. An. 931.* where you find *Sergius* mention'd in your former citation, *An. 908.* but a *Pseudo-Pope*; a meer *Usurper*, and his *Bastard John* made Pope after *Stephen*, by the power of *Wido* *Marquess of Tuscany*: and a little after he has these words, *Ita planè tanta vires Marchionibus Tusciae in urbe erant, ut pro arbitrio quos vellent, è Pontificali*

tificali sede deponerent, & alios intruderent. Here you see those Princes so powerful in Rome, that they could dispose, and set up what Popes they pleas'd. And I must desire you, good Doctor, to take this also along with you, and that from *Baronius*, that in all the time of those wicked, usurping, Schismatical Popes, Gods providence was over his Church, that notwithstanding these distracted and calamitous times, yet the Roman Church was preserv'd free, both from Schism and Heresie: For had you cast your eye but a little farther, from *nu. 5. to nu. 7.* you should have found these words, *Cum tanta ista urgerent hoc seculo mala, & scandala increbrescerent, tamen non est inventus qui eam de causa se ab ipsa Ecclesia Romanâ abscinderet Schismate, aut Heresi eandem impugnaret, sed omnes ubiq; Gentium eidem Fidei vinculo, & obedientia fœdere juncti persistebant. An. 908, n. 7.* You see then that *Baronius* could not see your consequence, that because there were some tyrannical, usurping, and Schismatical Popes, therefore the whole Church of Rome must fail, or become Schismatical: and I am somewhat confident, that *D. Boughen* was the first that ever discover'd this undiscoverable consequence.

48. Those other words that you produce out of *Baronius* (*An. 373. n. 21.*) whereby you would make the world believe, that *Baronius* held an opinion, that the Pope by his own authority might make and alter Decrees in matters of Faith, as he pleas'd, are to be understood only thus, That the Pops, with the advise of his Bishops, may in a private Council for the peace and quietness of the Church, till a General Council may be call'd, publish Decrees concerning Doctrines of Faith; as also revoke, or alter such Decrees, according as it shall be found necessary or convenient for the peace and unity of the Church: But that the Pope can of himself revoke or alter the Decrees, determinations, or definitions of General Councils concerning Doctrines of Faith, this *Baronius* never taught; he was too great a Scholar, and too good a Catholique to maintain such a temerarious (I might say Heretical) Doctrine: and that this is the meaning of *Baronius* in that place, may appear by the context of his Narration, where he declares the readiness of *S. Gregory Nazianzen* to acquiesce and submit to the Decree of Pope *Damasus*, (who then govern'd the Church) upon a supposition, that the Pope had admitted the *Apollinarians* to the Council

at *Rome*, which notwithstanding was but a false pretence of the *Apollinarians*; where you may observe Doctor, that this blessed man was a Bishop in the Eastern Church, and had formerly wrote sharply against the *Apollinarians*; and yet upon a supposition, (though false) that they were reconcil'd to the Pope, and admitted to the Council at *Rome*, he profess, that he would in all subaission to the Pope, acquiesce, and not presume to censure, or question any Act or determination of the Pope, though it were concerning Doctrines of Faith.

49. I have now pass through your first answer, and purposed to have here concluded; but I meet with an impertinent authority of Doctor *Lawd*, which though I might justly have pass by, without taking any notice thereof, as having undertaken an answer to *D. Boughen*, not *D. Lawd*, especially since this of *D. Lawd* is already sufficiently answer'd, *Seet. 18.* yet I have thought fit to make this further examination of it.

To the question then; *Where was your Church before Lusher?* *D. Lawd* answers, *Where ours is now.* *Ans.* If by [*ours*] he means the particular Church of *Rome*, I must confess his answer to be true; for

the particular Church of Rome is a part or member of the Roman Catholike Church, and so were you before *Luther*; but with him you have apostatiz'd, and are fallen into Schism and Heresie, and instead of a Church, you are become an Heretical and Schismatical Congregation. *Luther* forsook the whole Church, and those, that soon after his Apostacy adhered to his Heresies, followed him also in his Apostacy, they having been all members of that Church which *Luther* had forsaken. But this, you will say, was no separation, but a reformation, for that *D. Lawd* drives at; *One and the same Church still* (saith he) *one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity, your part of the same Church* (by [your part] he means the Church of Rome) *remaining in corruption, and our part of the same Church under Reformation.* Good God, how can any society of men, professing themselves Christians, be one and the same Church, and that in substance with that, from which they separated both in Faith and communion? Or what can be a separation, if this be not? If you have not separated yourselves from the Catholique Church, then were the *Arrians, Nestorians, Macedonians, Pelagians, &c.* no Heretiques; neither

ther were they separated from the *Catholic Church*, but were only under *Reformation*. Do not you oppose and deny *Doctrines of Faith*, as antiently and as universally receiv'd by the *Church*, as those that the *Arrians*, *Nestorians*, *Macedonians*, *Pelagians*, &c. oppos'd and denied? What difference can you make between *Arrius* and *Luther*, in respect of their apostasie? Did not *Luther* set himself against the whole world as well as *Arrius*? Did not the whole *Christian world*, besides your selves, upon your first *Reformation* (as you call it) detest your new *Doctrines*, and abhor your communion? Did not the pretended *Greek Church* it self (into whose communion you were *Petitioners* to be admitted) condemn your new *Doctrines* as *Heretical*, and refuse to receive you into their communion? Read the book entitled, *Censura Orientalis Ecclesiae*; and you shall there find the *Greek Church* maintaining (and that against the *Protestants*) the *Doctrine of seven Sacraments*, cap. 7. of *Transubstantiation*, and *real presence of Christs body in the blessed Sacrament*, c. 10. of *auricular confession*, c. 11. of the *unbloudy propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass*, c. 13. of *free will*, c. 18. of *Traditions*, c. 20. of *Invocation of Saints*, and *Vene-*

neration of Images, c. 21. Was there any one man in the whole world, that profess your Doctrine before *Luther*? and yet, forthwith, yours was no separation from the *Catholique Church*, but a *Reformation*, a blessed *Reformation*, that must necessarily justify all former Heresies, that ever were condemn'd, and all Heretiques and Schismatiques that ever separated themselves from Gods Church. To say no more, where is your *succession of Bishops and Pastors*, which are essential to Gods Church? If the *consecration* of your pretended Bishops was never valid, then must also the *Ordination* of your pretended Priests be invalid; and it never yet could, nor ever can appear, that you had either Bishop consecrated, or Priest ordained, either lawfully or validly, since *Queen Marye's* days. But I am sure there are most strong and pregnant arguments for the contrary. I deny not, but that perchance there might be some Priests ordained validly (though sacrilegiously) by that Apostate Bishop of *Spalato*, in the time of his stay in *England*; but what is that to a *succession* of Priests and Bishops?

I have now done with the first answer, and pass to the second; which because I find to consist principally of scurrilities, per-

personal and malicious invectives, and repetitions of former *fallacies*, my reply will be the shorter, since I shall in many things refer the Reader to my former answers, and take notice here only of that which I shall find to be new matter.

50. And here at the very first entrance I meet with an old fallacy, a ridiculous argument already answered, Sect. 5. to which I must refer the Reader. I will here add this only; That before *S. Peter* translated his *Chair* from *Antioch* to *Rome*, the *Catholique Church* might be properly called the *Church of Antioch*, which ever since has been called the *Roman Church*, and ever will be, until *S. Peters* Successor shall translate his *Chair* to some other place.

51. After this follows a most notorious falshood, viz. *That in the time of S. Hilary of Poitiers, there was at Rome no Church, no communion of Saints, She and those in communion with her, were heretical, and complied with Arrius*: This is most apparently false by the Records of all Histories; for at that time the *Westerne Church* was nothing so much infected with *Arrianism*, as the *Eastern*, besides *S. Hilary* in that place by you cited Sect. 23. has not so much as named the *Church of Rome*, and therefore has not in particular exclu-

ded it from the Catholique Church. But from those words of the Father [*ceteris extra Gallias*] you would prove, that all the world besides France was out of the Catholique Church; for (say you) *There was then no communion with Rome, unless it can be prov'd, that Rome was in France, Sect. 23.* But pray tell me Doctor, Was *Alexandria* and *Sardinia* more in France, then *Rome*? and yet you here confess, that at the very same time those were Catholique and Orthodox Churches; so that it must necessarily follow, either that *Alexandria* and *Sardinia* were in France, or else that some other Churches, besides France, were Catholique and Orthodox, and if so, why not *Rome*? especially since that Father did not in particular charge *Rome* with *Arrianism*, more then *Alexandria* and *Sardinia*; so that if you by those general words of the Father will exclude *Rome*, I may also as well exclude *Alexandria* and *Sardinia* from the Catholique Church: Wherefore you have forc't your self to interpret those words of the Father, as I have done, Sect. 34. or else you must unsay what you have said, and deny *Alexandria* and *Sardinia* to have been at that time Catholique and Orthodox Churches, unless you can prove, that *Alexandria* and *Sardinia* are in France.

52. Hitherto then you have shewed no Church at all distinct from the Roman Church in any age, though you were pleas'd to say Sect. 3. of this second answer, *That your learning is such, that you doe know such a Church, and your charity such, that you have shewn it.*

It seems you shewed it so well, that M.T.B. was thereby fully satisfied, that the *Catholique Church* never was, nor can be distinct from the Church of Rome; and has thereupon imbraced her communion, and is by Gods grace, become a good *Catholique*. Thus has God been pleased to produce good out of evil, to work his happiness out of your ignorance, and to strengthen him by your weakness.

53. I pass by your scurrilous speeches against M.T.B. as your comparing him to Seneca's *wives fool*; your charging him for not being able to search the Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers, to discover the antiquity and succession of your Doctrine there (where no man ever yet did, or can discover it) I will only say this, that M.T.B. has shewn more wit and judgment in one line, then you have in all your Pamphlet, and has said more in one sentence, then you, or all the Rabble of your Sect can answer in an age. But let us see how you
prove

prove the antiquity of your Doctrine.

54. *The Doctrine (you say) of the Church of England is clear in your Book of Common-Prayer, as for the positive part; and in your book of Articles, wherein much is Negative.* *Ans.* A very antient Doctrine then it must be, your Book of Common-Prayer being made not much above 100. years since, viz. 29. May 1549. in the reign of K. Edward the Sixth; and your Book of Articles not much above half an hundred. But was your book of Common-Prayer intended for a *Confession of Faith*, or for publique *Service and Devotion*? Is there any point of Faith or Doctrine absolutely declar'd and defin'd there? You will say, perchance, that in the three *Creeds* are contain'd divers Declarations and definitions of Faith; I confess it, but those *Creeds* are not inserted there meerly as definitions of Faith, with a precept under a curse, that all should believe whatsoever is there declar'd, but as parts of your *Publique Service*, that by frequent repetition thereof, the vulgar people might know the principal points of Faith necessary for salvation, I deny not; but some Doctrines may be deducible thence, though nothing positively declared, it being a book which belongs rather to the

Dis.

Discipline, then **Doctrin**e of your pretend-
ed Church.

55. *The positive Doctrin*e, you say, of
your Church contained in that Book, was
ever professed, and is visible in all Catho-
lique Writers. *Ans*w. I confess, that most
(if not all) of the Doctrines deducible
thence, were ever professed, and are visi-
ble in all Catholique Writers, because they
are the Doctrines of the Roman Catholique
Church, whence you have borrowed them,
as you have your whole book of Common-
Prayer, and the Scripture it self, only
you have taken the sacrilegious boldness to
expunge out of both what your private
phancies would not admit: but if you can
shew any one of your negative or positive
Doctrines contain'd in your book of Ar-
ticles, and which is opposite to the Do-
ctrine of the Church of Rome, in any one
Catholique Writer, Father, or Council,
from the time of the Apostles to Luthers
Apostase, I here protest before all the
world, that I will then become a Prose-
stant my self, or whatsoever else you will
command me to be.

56. But whereas you say, That the most
skilful (of the Roman Catholique Party)
are not able to shew a succession of men pro-
fessing the Doctrine of the Church of
Rome,

Rome, in the first 700. years of Christianity : I am so amaz'd , that I know not whether I should charge you with *gross ignorance*, or *bellish malice* : In plain terms, you must be either a most ignorant animal, or a malicious deceiver. Is it possible that you should obtrude such a notorious falshood to the world, and not blush ? certainly you never read the Fathers, nor Councils , nor therein examin'd the ancient Doctrine and practise of the Church, or if you have (as you pretend) your judgment is not sufficient to understand them ; or else malice and obstinacy hath so blinded you, that you cannot see it there, as the malicious and obstinate Jews could not see our blessed Saviours Divinity through so many stupendious miracles. The Sun it self was never so clear at noon-day, as the succession of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, and of men professing the same, not only for the first 700. years of Christianity , but from the time of the Apostles to this present day. Has it not been already clearly shewn by divers learned Catholique Writers , by you yet un-answer'd ? Has not *Bellarmino* , *Baronius*, *Cardinal Peron*, *D. Stratford*, &c. most evidently manifested it to the world ? Were I not confin'd within the narrow

pre;

precincts of a Reply, I could most plainly demonstrate it my self; but it would require a far larger volume: then I have now time or opportunity to compose: It is sufficient for me, since you have appealed to the first 500. years after our Saviours birth, that I have proved (Sect. 44.) that the Doctrine of those times is not different from, but the very same with the present Doctrine of the *Roman Catholike Church.*

57. Your Church (of England) you say, *has been visible since the first or second Conversion, though not alwayes under Reformation.* *Ans^w.* Which you mean by the first or second Conversion, I know not; but from the time of her last Conversion by *S. Augustine* the Monk. (which is commonly reputed her third conversion) for almost 1000. years together, you were an apparent visible part of the Church Catholique; but when you began your blessed Reformation, you then ceast to be a Church, or a part of the *Catholique Church.* For in *K. Hen. eight's* dayes you began your Schism, separating your selves from the communion of your holy Mother the Church of Rome, and the Bishop thereof, the common Pastor of Christs Church; and in *K. Edw. the Sixths* Reign your Schism begat Heresie, and under this hap-

py Reformation you have ever since continued.

But now Doctor, where are your pretended Bishops? what is become of your book of *Common-Prayer*? who now subscribes to your 39. Articles? You cannot reasonably deny, but those, who have lately reformed you, had more authority and reason for it, then you had to reform the whole Church, or to censure Doctrines of Faith universally taught by Gods Church, and receiv'd as such by all your Fore-fathers, from the time of *Englands* conversion to the Christian Faith, till after *Luthers* apostasie: You considered not, when under pretence of Reformation you forsook the whole Church, that you did but leave a patern to your Successors, how they also, when they should think fit, might forsake you, and reform this your blessed Reformation, as by Gods just judgments they have lately done: For I am sure they walk by the same Rule of Scripture, and are as competent Judges, and as able interpreters thereof, as ever you were, or can be; only they are not so tyrannical as you were, who forced men against their consciences to subscribe to your Doctrine and Discipline, which according to your own principles, might be erroneous and superstitious.

58. But

58. But you say Sect. 9. That you never read in *Fathers or Councils*, That to communicate with Rome, is either a sure, or any token of a good Catholic. *Answer.* Then you never read *S. Hieroms* 57 Epist. to Pope *Damasus*, where you might have seen these words, *Ego Beatitudini tue, id est Cathedra Petri, communionem confocior, super illam Petram edificatam Ecclesiam scio*, Mat. 16. 18. *quicumque extra hanc Domum agnum comederit, prophanus est; si quis in Arca Noë non fuerit, peribit regnante diluvio; quicumque tecum non colligit, spargit; Hoc est, qui Christi non est, Anti-christi est.* I am (saith *S. Hierom*) joyned in communion to your Holiness, that is, to *Peters Chair*, upon that *Rock* I know the Church to be built, whosoever out of this House eats the Lamb, is prophane; whosoever shall not be in *Noahs Ark*, shall perish in the Deluge; he that gathers not with thee, scatters, that is, he that is not of Christ, is of Anti-christ. These are *S. Hieroms* own words, by which it is most plain, that he that is not in communion with *S. Peters Chair*, with the Church and Bishop of Rome, is out of Gods Church, and therefore no Catholic.

Neither did you ever read *S. Ambrose's* Funeral Oration on the death of his brother

ther *Satyrus*, where you might have found these words, *Advocavit ad se Episcopum, &c. percontatusq; ex eo est, utrumnam cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est, cum Romana Ecclesia conveniret.* He call'd unto him a Bishop, and asked him, whether he were in communion with the Catholique Bishops, that is, with the Church of Rome. And here take notice, Doctor, that this [*Hoc est, that is*] as likewise that [*id est, and hoc est.*] in the former citation out of *S. Hierom*, are the Fathers own interpretation, not mine.

Had you read *S. Augustin's* 162. Epistle, you might have discovered these words there: *Hic (Cecilianus) contemnere potuit, &c. He (Cecilianus) might despise the conspiring multitude of his enemies, when he perceiv'd himself to be united to the Church of Rome, where the principality of the Apostolique Chair ever flourish'd, by communicatory letters.* These three learned Fathers, and glorious lights of Gods church were *Coetaneans*, though *S. Ambrose* died in the fourth century after *Christs* birth, and *S. Hierom* and *S. Augustine* in the fifth.

Had you read *S. Cyprian's* second Epistle to Pope *Cornelius*, li. 4. who lived in the year of *Christ*, 250. you might have found these

these words; *Scripsisti etiam, ut exemplum, &c.* You wrote also unto me, to send a copy of those Letters to Cornelius our Colleague, that he laying aside all care, might know that you are in communion with him, that is, with the Catholique Church. This [*Hoc est, that is,*] also is not my addition, but S. Cyprians own words. It seems you were a stranger to S. Irenæus's Doctrine, who liv'd in the year of Christ 180. which is this; *Ad hanc enim (Romanam) Ecclesiam propter potentiorē principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undiq̃ fideles*; It is necessary that every Church, that is, all the faithful from all parts, should range themselves to this Church (of Rome) for its more powerful principality, li. 3. c. 3. And now Doctor, what can you say? Methinks you look somewhat black upon it; you must withall take notice, that all these Fathers liv'd within the first 500. years to which you have appealed, and there is not one of all these testimonies but is plainly against you, evidently proving it not only a sure, but a necessary and essential token of a good Catholique, to communicate with the Church of Rome. A thousand testimonies more might be alledg'd, but these are sufficient to publish

D. Boughens

D. Boughens ignorance to the world. I thought it not impertinent to add one testimony more (in confirmation of this, and what I said before, Sect. 32. of *Johu* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in his Epistle to *Hormisdas*, who about the beginning of the century, viz. An. 514. was elected Pope, that thereby the communion of the Greek Church with the Roman, and her subjection to the Apostolique See of Rome, may plainly appear. *Promittentes in sequente tempore, &c.* We promise (saith he) hereafter not to commemorate those in the sacred mysteries, who have been secluded from the communion of the Catholique Church, that is, who consent not fully with the See Apostolique. Here is the opinion of the great Patriarch of the East, above a 1100. years since, That those who were separated from the See Apostolique, were out of the communion of the Catholique Church: and by this it appears how true your following words are, viz. That faith which we receiv'd from the Apostles, and Councils, and Fathers, we keep whole and undefiled, without alteration, addition, or diminution. What but a shameless man could have the face to publish such a notorious falshood to the world? By this appears also how evidently false that saying
of

of yours is (at least as you apply it) in the beginning of your 11. Sect. viz. *That this National Church is as much Catholique and Apostolique as can be desired.*

I confess, this National Church (that is, those that preserve the antient Catholique and Apostolique Faith, and keep themselves within the communion of the holy *Catholique Church*) is, God be praised, as much Catholique and Apostolique, as can be desired: but I am sure, those of your Congregation, or pretended church, are neither Catholique or Apostolique, unless to forsake the communion of the *Catholique Church*, and the Doctrines and Traditions of the Apostles, be to be Catholique and Apostolique, as I have already abundantly proved. And that Rule which you cite out of *Vincent Lyrinens.* in the later end of your 10. Sect. [*Quod ubiq, quod semper, quod ab omnibus, &c.* *That which hath been believed in all places, at all times, by all the Fathers, that is truly Catholique*] will rise up in Judgment against you. By this Rule you have condemn'd your self of Schism and Heresie; for your Doctrine has been so far from being believed in all places, at all times, and by all the Fathers, that it is impossible for you to shew any one place, any one

one time, or any one Father; nay, any one man before *Luthers* Apostasie, that maintain'd the Doctrines which are now comprised in your *Book of Articles*: neither can you produce any one person at any time or place, that held any one point of Doctrine, wherein you dissent from, and oppose the Church of Rome, except such only, as were noted by the Church for Innovators in Religion, and condemn'd for Heretiques.

59. And whereas you are pleas'd to insult over Mr. T. B. Sect. 12. in these high and daring speeches. [*Is not all true? Refute it, if you can: deny it, if you have the face*] I, or any reasonable man, may have the face to tell you, that you here show your selfe to be very ignorant, impudent, and impertinent. For the Doctrine of that part of your 19. Article. viz. [*That the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithfull men in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same*] Mr. T. B. never denied, or question'd; But denies that this doctrine of your 19. Article can consist with your opinion, who hold, that the Church of Rome is a true Church, a member of the Church
Ca.

Catholique, though according to divers of your *Articles* cited by Mr. T. B. n. 3. She neither preaches the pure Word of God, nor duly administers the Sacraments, no, not in all those things, that of necessity are requisite for the same. For how can that be essentially a part of the Catholique Church, which observes not that which is essentiall to the Catholique Church, as is the preaching of the pure Word of God, and the due administration of the Sacraments, according to that definition of the Church in your 19. *Article*?

Besides, how can you vindicate that Church from heresie, that for Doctrines of Faith necessary to salvation teaches *blasphemous fables*? Art. 31. Or that Sacrilegiously robs the Laity of Christ's blood, with which you charge the Church of Rome, Sect. 11. of your first *Answer*: Or that maintaines Doctrines repugnant to plaine words of Scripture? Sect. 24. *ib.* Or that erres in Doctrine of faith, as you tax the Church of Rome? Sect. 14. of your second *Answer*. Or that gives divine worship to Images and Reliques, wherewith you charge the Church of Rome. Sect. 34. *ib.*? Can any Church be *blasphemous*, *sacrilegious*, *idolatrous*, repugnant in her Doctrines to plaine words of Scripture, erroneous in Do-

Doctrines of Faith, and yet not be heretical, but continue still essentially a true Church?

But because you are pleas'd to extend your Charity beyond Reason towards the Church of Rome, I will not quarrell with you about it; onely I must take notice of the Argument, which you bring to prove it. God (say you) blames the Church of Pergamos for enduring the seat of Satan within her Diocese, as also for holding that odious Doctrine of the Nicolaitans, and yet grants her to be a Church. *Ans.* Herein you are much mistaken, Doctor, for God blames not the Church, but the Angell of the Church of Pergamos; which by many Catholique Expositors both Ancient and Moderne; as also by divers of your owne Sect and Religion, is interpreted, *The bishop of the Church.* If the Church of Pergamos had held the Doctrine of the Nicolaitans, She had bin Hereticall, and consequently no Church: but it was the Bishop, not the Church, that was hereticall. And if God may charge the Bishop of the Church of Pergamos with Heresie, and yet grant Pergamos to be a true Church; why may not the Church of Rome continue a true Church, though the Bishop thereof fall into heresie?

60. your taking the Church of Rome for maim-

maining the blessed Sacrament. Sect. 13. has been fully answer'd already. Sect. 18. 19. and. Sect. 41.

61. But the Doctor is very hot in proving, that the Church must erre with her Bishop; and therefore the Church of Rome was no Church, when her Bishops were hereticall. *Such as the Bishop is* (saies he) *such is the Church presumed to be.* Answ. I know none but Dr. Boughen, that was ever guilty of so silly a Presumption. But S. Cyprians Authority is urg'd to prove it, who sayes, *That as the Bishop is in the Church, so is the Church in the Bishop.* I confesse, I find in S. Cyprian. (Epist. lib. 4. Ep. 9.) these words; *Christiani sunt Ecclesia & plebs Sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo grex adhaerens; unde scire debet, Episcopum in Ecclesia esse & Ecclesiam in Episcopo.* Christians are a Church, and Common people, united to the Priest, and a Flock adhering to its Pastor; whence you must know, that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop. What is all this to the purpose? The Bishop is in the Church, as a King is in his Kingdome, or a Generall in his Army; and the Church likewise is in the Bishop, not formally, but communicative; all the particular members thereof being in communion

F

munion

munion with the Bishop, as their *Head*. And this is all that can be gather'd from those words of the *Father*. Since then the Church cannot be *Formally* in the *Bishop*, but onely by way of communion, subjection, government, or *Discipline*; why may not the Church be *Catholique*, though the Bishop be *Hereticall*?

But from this false ground the Doctor will prosecute his old fallacy, and will still be endeavouring to prove, that the Church of *Rome* could not be *Catholique*, when the Bishops thereof were heretiques. Sect, 19. *All Heretiques* (sayes he) *while such, both themselves and all that side with them, are secluded from Ecclesiastical communion every way. But divers Popes were Heretiques or Schismatiques; therefore the Church of Rome while her Bishops were heretical was in an ill case.* *Ans.* Is not this a fine conclusion from those Premises? what form or consequence is this here of a Syllogism? And if the conclusion did follow out of those Premises, what were this to the purpose? The Church may be in an ill case, when the Bishop is in heresie, yet not *Hereticall*. But behold another argument to prove the Church of *Rome* not *Catholique*: *When all Episcopal Acts were voyd, the Church could not possibly be Catholike. But when the Bishops were*

were Heretiques, all Episcopall Acts were void; therefore the Church could not possibly be Catholique. *Ans^w.* This consequence is much like the other: All the Acts of Heretical Bishops are void; therefore the Church cannot possibly be Catholique; as if the Faith of the Church depended on the Acts of the Bishop. But a confirmation thereof is brought from S. *Hilaries* testimony, who professeth, as you say, That (in these Western parts) there was in his time no Christian communion, but in France. *Ans^w.* You do well to put those words [in these Western parts] in a parenthesis, for they are yours, not S. *Hilaries*; as may appear by his words by you cited, Sect. 23. where those words [ceteris extra Gallias] may comprehend the Eastern as well as the Western Churches. And if you read Ecclesiastical Histories, you shall find, that in S. *Hilaries* time the Eastern Churches were far more infected with *Arrianism*, then the Western.

62. Besides, you may remember, Doctor, that in the beginning of this second answer, you confest, that in S. *Hilaries* time, at that very time when Rome (as you falsely say) was *Arrian*, *Sardinia* was a Catholique and Orthodox Church: How can that agree with this which you here en-

deavour to prove out of S. Hilary? Was not *Sardinia* part of the Western Church? How then could all the Western parts be excluded from *Christian communion*, besides France, when *Sardinia*, which is in these Western parts, was (as your self confess) a Catholique and Orthodox Church? How can these two possibly consist together? It seems you have forgot your self. *Oportet mendacem esse memorem.*

60. After all the other Popes. *Felix* is brought in for communicating with *Arrians*, and *Socrates* and *Zozomen* are alledged to prove, that therefore *Rome* it self was then accounted *Arrian*. What then, says *Socrates*? that *Liberius* was banish'd for his constancy in defending the Catholique Faith against the *Arrians*, and that *Felix* was appointed to succeed him in the *Papacy*, who was, *Arrianæ Schæ additus*: but there is not one word there of *Rome's* being *Arrian*. (*Socrat. li. 2. c. 29.*) And if *Felix* did perchance sometimes favour the *Arrian* Faction, yet was it before he was elected Pope, not afterwards; as appears plainly by *Zozomen* in the very place by you cited, *li. 4. c. 10.* *Liberius Ecclesiæ Romanæ Episcopatu privatus est, cui præfuitur Felix illius Cleri Diaconus, quem aiunt Fidei Concilij Nicani semper con-*

consensisse, & omnino, quantum pertinebat ad Religionem, reprehensione caruisse. Liberius (saith he) was depriv'd of the Bishoprick of the Roman Church, to which Felix, a Deacon of that Clergy, was preferred, who is said to have alwayes consented to the Faith of the Nicene Council, and was never blameable for any thing that concerned Religion. These are the very words of Sozomen, and in the very same place cited by the Doctor. Nothing there concerning Felix or Rome's being Arrian. Thus the Reader may see how fraudulently the Doctor has dealt with the world.

Well, but Felix ordained divers Arrians; what then? must he therefore be an Arrian himself? or must he necessarily know them to be such?

But he communicated with Arrians; and must he therefore be an Arrian? Do not Catholiques at this time communicate with Heretiques in England, France, Germany, &c. in outward conversation and civil commerce, though not in their Heresie? and you neither have prov'd, nor ever can prove, that Felix communicated with the Arrians in their heretical and blasphemous Doctrine, but in outward conversation only, which is, and ever was lawful for any Catholique.

61. To pass by your impertinent distinction between a *profest* and a *close* Heretique, as being nothing to the purpose: I come to your other passage, wherein you say, and cite some *Canons* for it; *That the communion of the Church is estimated by communicating with the Bishop, and if any, whether Priest, or other, shall sever themselves from the Canonical Bishop, they are censur'd to be Heretiques.* *Ans^w.* This is to be understood when the Bishop is Catholique, and keeps himself within the communion of the Catholique Church; but if the Bishop be heretical, and the Church shall communicate with him in his Heresie, the Church also becomes heretical, be the Bishop thereof a *profest* or *close* Heretique, it matters not: but by this your own Rule you must confess your selves Heretiques, because you did originally sever your selves from your Canonical Catholique Bishops, and followed your owne, and other mens new inventions; and when all your pretended bishops were heretical, you communicated with them and their heresies.

62. But the bishop may be either a *profest* or *close* Heretique, and yet the Church may be Catholique: and this your self expressly grant in your following Sect. 22. where

where you say, *That you believe that the King of England, and Arch-bishop of Canterbury, either, or both of them, may be Heretiques, and this Church not so; since it is not their being, but our complying that makes us heretical.* Herein you have fully contradicted your self, and granted whatsoever I have said concerning this point: For if the Church of England may be Catholique, though both King and Metropolitan thereof be Heretiques, why may not the Church of Rome be Catholique, though the bishop thereof be heretical?

63. But (say you) if all our Bishops be of the same Religion with them, this Church is in an ill case. *Answer.* I say so too; yet it may be Catholique. All your pretended bishops may be heretical (as they were all for about these 100. years together last past) and yet there may be a Catholique Church in England. It is possible that the particular members of each Diocess may not comply with their bishop in his Heresie; and then, according to your own saying, they are not heretical. The inferiour Priests and people may preserve their faith, though all the bishops fall from it; but what is all this to the purpose? Were ever all the bishops that were subject to the Patriarchal

Sea of Rome, at one and the same time, Heretiques? I suppose, no man besides your self was ever possess'd with such a ridiculous imagination. What if your Arch-bishop of *Canterbury* alone had been an Heretique, and all the other bishops within his Province Catholique? will you therefore conclude, that the particular *Church* or *Diocess* of *Canterbury* must necessarily have been heretical? If you say so, you plainly contradict your self, who even now said, that it is not the *Kings* or *Arch-bishops* being heretical, but our complying with them, that makes us heretical, Sect. 22.

64. But the Doctor pursues this argument close, and endeavours to prove, that *when the King and Priest joyn together, it hath a strange influence upon the people, for good or bad.* *Ans.* What then? must the people therefore of necessity be good or bad, according as the King and Priest are? cannot Gods grace overcome this influence, and preserve the people from infection? but you say; *When King Ahaz, and Urijah the Priest professed Idolatry, though many good men were residents among them, yet was the City and people accounted heretical.* *Ans.* First, it appears not by the Text, that they were so accounted. Se-

Secondly, if they were accompted heretical, does it herefore necessarily follow, that they were so? Does truth and falsehood depend on the opinions of men? if so, then every man in his own opinion would be Catholique, and all the world besides, that concur not with him in his judgment, would be Heretiques. It is not necessary that every one must be good or bad, catholique, or heretique, according as some men (perchance) out of error, either in doctrine or fact, shall esteem him: but what if that city and people were (not only accompted, but) truly and really heretical, must it therefore always follow, that when the King and Priest are heretical, the city and people must of necessity be so too? What if *Constantius* the Emperor, and *Leonius* the bishop? What if *Valens* and *Eudoxius* by joyning together in heresie withdrew many, partly by power, partly by example from the Catholique Faith; does it therefore always necessarily follow, that when the Prince and Priest joyn in heresie, the people also must be heretical? Must every thing come to pass, because it may come to pass? No, Doctor, the young Sophisters will tell you, that, *à posse & esse non valet argumentum.*

65. And whereas you say, that under

F 5

King

King *Edward VI.* and Queen *Mary*, the Religion of the church was judged of by the Governours : I answer, that the Religion of this Nation (not of the church, for 'tis not the Religion of the Prince, but the profession of the antient Catholique Faith, that constitutes a church) was judged of, not by the Governours, but by the Lawes that were made in *K. Edw. VI.* and Queen *Maryes* daies respectively, either to establish a new upstart Religion, never before heard of in the world, or to re-establish the antient Catholique Faith : So that in *K. Edw. VI.* days the Nation might be said to be heretical, but the Church was even at that time Catholike, otherwise it could not have been a church; and in *Q. Maryes* daies both church and Nation were Catholique. But you cannot prove that ever the *Roman Nation*, much less the *Roman Church* was heretical, since their first conversion to the Christian faith. And if the Pope, and with him all the bishops of *Italy* had at the same time forsaken the Catholique faith, yet the *Church of Rome* might still have retain'd her prerogative of being the Mother church, and Head of all particular churches in the world. And though the Pope might have forfeited all his Ecclesiastical power and

Ju-

Jurisdiction, and so ceast to be Head of the church, yet the right of *S. Peters Chair* had always remained in the Church of *Rome*; for since the bishop is not the church formally, nor the church formally in the bishop, the church cannot formally erre with the bishop, neither must the church formally taken, be therefore heretical, because the bishop thereof is so. Now, I hope, I have done with this tedious and frivolous argument.

65. That the Church of *Rome* imposes a new sense on the articles of the *Creeds*, is a meer calumny, spoken gratis, without any colour or shew of proof. That the Church of *Rome* and you agree in the letter, not in the Exposition, is true; The Church of *Rome* following the Exposition of the Universal Tradition and practise of the church, and you your new phantastical and heretical Exposition: but though you did agree with the Roman Church in the Exposition, as well as in the letter, yet could you not be excus'd from heresie, because you oppose other Doctrines of Faith that are not contain'd in the three *Creeds*: for not all points of faith, that are necessary for all sorts of men to be believed, are comprehended in the three *Creeds*, either joyntly, or severally.

66. And whereas you charge the Church
of

of Rome, with imposing a new *Creed* of *Pius 4.* upon the church, against a canon of the *Council* of *Ephesus*. I answer, first, That which you mean is but a profession of Faith, wherein are contained certain *Doctrines* of faith that are not expressly comprehended in the *Creeds*. It can no more properly be called a *Creed*, then your book of *Articles*, which is your Profession of faith; and as not all, but some certain persons only amongst you, were bound by your Statutes to subscribe to that *Profession*; so likewise not every man, but some certain persons only are bound to subscribe to the other. Secondly, that *Profession* was agreed upon by the whole *Council*, and confirm'd by Pope *Pius 4.* It was neither compos'd, nor commanded by the Pope alone, but by him joyntly with the *Council*. Thirdly, there is not one Article of that *Profession* contrary or repugnant to any one article of the former *Creeds*: and although this had been a new *Creed*, as you call it, yet had it not been against any canon of the *Council* of *Ephesus*; that *Council*, at the most, forbidding only private persons to set forth, or publish any *Creed*, that should contain in it any *Doctrine* contrary to any article of belief in those former *Creeds*. Neither indeed
could

could the church in the *Council of Ephesus* debar the church in future ages of that power and authority, which the church in former ages assumed and exercised. Why should it be more unlawful for the church assembled in the *Council of Trent*, to set forth a new form of *Profession of Faith*, then it was for the church assembled in the *Council of Nice*, or *Constantinople*? No *Council* can rob the church of that power which *Christ* hath given her. And by this *Profession of Faith* the *Roman Church* has neither alter'd the letter, nor sense of former *Creeds*; though you dare be bold to say, *She has strangely alter'd the sense*. I confess, you are bold to say any thing, but you have prov'd nothing.

67. And whereas you say, you take the *Rule of Faith in the literal sense*, let us see (to give but one instance) since you make *Scripture* the sole *Rule* of your faith, whether you take those words of our blessed Saviour, *Mat. 26. 26. Mar. 14. 22. and Luc. 22. 19.* in the literal sense. Our B Saviour there takes Bread and Wine, and sayes, *This is my Body which is given (or broken) for you; This is my Bloud which is shed for you;* which you thus interpret, *This is a sign only of my Body, and this is a sign only of my Bloud.* You deny, that
the

the bread and wine which our B. Saviour took and blest, was truly and substantially converted into his body and bloud, and are not ashamed to say, that the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.

Let all the world judg, whether herein you take the Rule of Faith in the literal sense. It is much more plain, that you go against the very letter of the *Gospel*, against the expositions of the ancient Fathers, both *Greek* and *Latin*, the Declarations of Councils, the ancient and universal practise of the whole church, which alwayes adored the *B. Sacrament*, after consecration, with divine worship.

68. In Sect. 29. I meet with another absurd and impertinent distinction, *between error in Faith, and error in matters of Faith*; as if errors in Faith, and errors in matters of Faith were not all one. They have hitherto been esteemed all one, and that by those who have been far beyond you both in learning and judgment; though your sharp understanding be able to divide, and put a difference between them.

69. Much like to this is that saying of yours Sect. 30. *Every violation of the Faith, cuts not off from the Catholique Church, but a false opinion of God does.*

How

How then is that of *S. Paul* true, *Heb. 11. 6.* *Without faith it is impossible to please God.* Can a man violate Faith, though but in some one point, and yet be a **Catholique**? who ever thought so besides your self? by the same reason one and the same man may be at the same time both **Catholique** and **Heretique**. But to prove your new opinion, you produce an antient testimony of *S. Augustine*, (*de fid. & Symb. c. 20.*) *Hæretici de Deo falsa sentiendo, ipsam fidem violant, quapropter non pertinent ad Ecclesiam Catholicam.* Heretiques by having a false opinion of God, violate Faith it self, wherefore they belong not to the **Catholique Church**. *Ans^w.* Here is now a fine proof, if well examin'd. You must know **Doctor**, that the word [*Quapropter*] wherefore, refers to the words immediately going before; and then 'tis plain, that this testimony of the Father makes directly against you. For if men be therefore cut off from the **Catholique Church**, because they have violated the Faith, then it necessarily follows, that every violation of Faith cuts a man off from the **Catholique Church**. But in favour to the **Doctor**, let us once grant against all reason, that the word [*Quapropter*] may refer to the former words, and that the Father speaks as the

Doctor

Doctor would have him. What shall we discover then? even this consequence, *Heretiques by having a false opinion of God are cut off from the Catholique Church; therefore every violation of Faith cuts not off from the Catholique Church.* Most admirable! this is just like the rest. If this be a good consequence, there was never any bad or fallacious. Just so will I prove, that every damnable sin excludes not a man from Gods favour. *Murder and Adultery exclude a man from Gods favour; therefore not every damnable sin excludes a man from Gods favour.* You will say, this is no good consequence; I say so too, but I am sure it is as good as yours, the very same with yours.

70. Now we come to examine who are in *Schism*, the Church, or *Luthers* followers; or indeed, rather whether there be any Schism or no, between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, which the Doctor seems to deny. The truth is, M.T.B. has so gravel'd the poor Doctor, that he is forc'd to fly to most miserable and ridiculous shifts. M.T.B. very rationally and judiciously says, by way of objection, that *Christs mystical Body is but one; and although the Body be made up of divers members, yet all these members must communi-*
cate

gate one with another, for if a member be separated but by Schism, it is like an arm cut off from the Body, or a branch from the Vine, which makes that arm or branch no part of the Body or Vine. To this the Doctor answers thus, *What though all this be granted, will this make one of the two no Church? I believe not. Reply.* 'Tis very likely Doctor that you believe so, but what man of sense or understanding can believe so? Can a particular church separate from the whole Catholique Church, both in Doctrines of Faith and external communion, and yet not be Schismatical, but still continue a Catholique Church? who ever before D. Boughen could say or think so? Well, but S. Pauls authority is alledged, 1 Cor. 12. 25. where it is said, that all the members of the body must communicate one with another, in the same care one for another, in the same sufferings and rejoycings one with another. What then? Is there no other communion necessary to avoid Schism? This is just like your former consequences, *The members must communicate one with another in the same sufferings and rejoycings one with another; therefore to avoid Schism, there is no other communion necessary.* I am sure, this is no necessary consequence; but with
such

such poor fallacies as these, Heretiques have always endeavour'd to deceive the world. Neither can that place of the *Apostle* advantage you at all; for he there only compares Christ's mystical body, the Church, to the natural body; and sayes, that as all the members of the natural body mutually assist each other, and without any Schism, that is, any division, or discord, joyntly concur to preserve the body; so also in the Church, which is Christs mystical body, there are different orders, functions, and offices, all which ought mutually to assist each other for the preservation of the whole church: this is all that *S. Paul* intends in that place, as by the context of the whole cha. will evidently appear to any indifferent Reader.

71. *We are not bound* (you say, Sect. 32.) *to communicate with the Church of Rome in the same ceremonies, gesture, superstition, or error.* *Ans^r.* First, I deny that the Roman Church is, or ever was, or can be guilty of superstition, or error in faith. Secondly, I grant that you are bound not to communicate with any Nation, or people in superstition, or error; As also, that you are not bound to use the ceremonies of other Catholique Churches. There be divers particular Churches that differ from each other in some ceremonies, and yet are
in

in perfect charity, and communicate with each other. As for example, The *Westerne Church* consecrates in unleavened bread, after the example of our B. Saviour, who first instituted the blessed Sacrament, and consecrated in unleavened bread; but the *Greeke Church* has alwaies accustomed to consecrate in leavened bread: besides, these two Churches differ in divers ceremonies of the *Mass*, though not in any substantiall or essentiall part thereof. And yet these two churches are in perfect charity and communion with each other. (I speak here of the true Catholique *Greek Church*, not of those schismatiques and Heretiques, who have cut themselves off from the Catholique Church; whom notwithstanding you are pleas'd to call the *Greeke Church*.) Neither doethose churches abhorre each others ceremonies as superstitious or unlawfull, but the particular members of each church are most ready to conforme to the ceremonies and discipline of each other, according as any of them shall travell or passe from one church to the other. As when a bishop or Priest of the *Easterne church* travells into any part of the *Westerne*, he then makes no scruple to consecrate in unleavened bread, as formerly in his own church he consecrated in leavened; but when any two churches shall

shall abhorre and detest the Doctrine and ceremonies of each other, as hereticall, sacrilegious, idolatrous, and repugnant to plaine *Scripture*, there is then a perfect schisme. And since these two abhorre each others communion, charging each other with sacrilegious, idolatrous, and damnable errors, they cannot both meet in the Catholique Church; and therefore one of them must necessarily be cut off from Christ's mysticall body, either by heresie or schisme, or both. Wherefore in granting that assertion of Mr. T. B. you must also grant, that either the Church of Rome, or the Protestants, are guilty of heresie, or schisme, or both; and therefore no part of the Catholique Church.

72. It is then now time to show who is the schismaticque. And that you are schismaticall, I prove thus.

Those that have seperated themselves from the communion of the Catholique Church, are schismaticall.

But you have separated your selves from the communion of the Catholique Church.

Ergo. You are Schismaticall.

The *Major* is evident, and often granted by the Doctor; the *minor* is thus prov'd.

Those that have separated themselves from

from the communion of the bishop and Church of Rome, have separated themselves from the Catholique Church.

But you have seperated your selves from the communion of the bishop, and Church of Rome.

Ergo. You have separated your selves from the communion of the Catholique Church.

The *minor* is acknowledg'd by the Doctor, Sect. 19. of his first *Answer*. The *major* is sufficiently proved, Sect. 25. and Sect. 58. wherefore I will here only add some few authentique testimonies more in prooffe thereof. S. Cyprian sayes, (li. 4. ep. 8. *ad Cornel. Pontif.*) *Placuit ut per Episcopos, retentâ à nobis rei veritate ad comprobendam ordinationem tuam, &c. ut te universi Collegæ nostri, & communionem tuam, id est, Catholica Ecclesia unitatem pariter & charitatem probarent firmiter & tenerent. Wee thought fit, &c. that all our fellow bishops might steadfastly approve of and imbrace you, and your communion, that is, the Catholique Churches unity and charity. Is it not plaine by these words, that the unity of the Catholique Church consists in the communion with the Bishop of Rome? And if there be no Catholique unity, but in communion with the Bishop*

shop of Rome ; it is apparently impossible, that any one can be united to the Catholique Church, that is not in communion with the Bishop and the Church of Rome. Besides, that the Church is built upon S. Peter and his Successors, I have already fully proved. Sect. 25. and Sect. 58. to which I will add one testimonie more out of S. Cyprian. (*Epist. ad Quintinum.*) *Nam nec Petrus, quem primum elegit, & super quem edificavit Ecclesiam suam &c.* For neither Peter, whom our Lord chose to be the first, and upon whom he built his Church. &c. The like words he has (*Ser. 3. de bon. pat.*) whosoever then forsakes the foundation, cannot be part of the house or building. The whole building rests upon the foundation ; wherfore he that is separated from the foundation, is separated also from the building, which is the house, the Church of God. And you must remember, Doctor, that S. Cyprian liv'd in the yeare of Christ 250. and therefore long within the first 500. yeares, to which you have appeal'd, Sect. 27. so that you must either confesse the Protestants to be out of the communion of the Catholique Church, and consequently schismaticall, at the least ; or else you must revoke and renounce your appeale.

If you will say, that the sense of the whole
Church

Church appeares not fully in the writings of particular Fathers; you shall heare the confession and acknowledgment of 520. Fathers assembled in the fourth Generall Councell at *Calcedon*, in the yeare of Christ 451. who all unanimously acknowledge Pope *Leo* their head. Their words are; *Quibus tu quidem sicut membris caput praeras*, Over whom (that is the Fathers assembled in the Councell) thou wert as the Head over the members. And it is to be observ'd, that this Councell was held in the Easterne Church, and consisted for the most part of the Fathers of that Church; wherein notwithstanding Pope *Leo's* Delegates sate in the uppermost Seat, and took place of the Patriarch of *Constantinople* himself, even in his own Patriarchate; which would never have been permitted, had not the Pope's Jurisdiction extended to the Eastern, as wel as the Western Churches. About 50. yeares after the Councell, did not the Eastern bishops acknowledge that it was necessary for all Christians to communicate with the bishop and Church of *Rome*? you have heard, Sect. 58. that *Iohn* Patriarch of *Constantinople* excluded al from the communion of the Catholique Church, that were divided from the *Apostolique* see of *Rome*; which, doubtlesse, the great Patriarch

triarch of the *East* would never have acknowledged, had it not descended by universall Tradition, that the Bishop of *Rome* was appointed by Christ to be the supreme Pastor and Governour of the whole Church. Examine all this Patriarch's letters written to Pope *Hormisdas*, and you shall find them all directed to the Pope, after this manner. *Domino meo per omnia sanctissimo*. And can any reasonable man imagine, that so great a Patriarch would have stiled the Pope, his Lord, if his power in the Easterne Church had been absolute, and independent on the sea of *Rome*? In like manner *Dorotheus* Bishop of *Thessalonica* in the Eastern Church, in his Epistle to the same Pope has these words. *Ista nunc scripsi Beato Capiti nostro per Patricium*. &c. These things have I now written by *Patricius* to our Blessed Head.

By this it plainly appeares, that in those dayes, within the first 600. yeares of *Christ*, the Bishop of *Rome* was acknowledg'd the Head of the Eastern Churches, as well as of the Western; and that by the Eastern Bishops themselves, even by their cheife, and Head-Bishop, the Patriarch of the East; who likewise (as you have already heard) confest, that all Catholique Communion-floues from the Apostolique sea of *Rome*,

as the Head and Fountain thereof. And what better interpreter of Scripture, or more faithful preserver of Apostolique Traditions can there be, then the antient and universal practise of the Church?

To the practise of former Ages, and Declarations of antient Councils, let us joyn the definitions of later times, viz. of the Council of Florence, in the year 1439. where the Patriarch of Constantinople was present in person, and all the other Patriarchs, either personally, or by their Delegates. Let us then hear the whole Church speaking in that Council.

Item definimus Sanctam Apostolicam sedem, & Romanum Pontificem in universum Orbem tenere primatum, &c. (Concil. Florent. A&C. ult.) Also we declare, that the holy Apostolique See and Bishop of Rome hath the primacy over the whole world, and that the Bishop of Rome is S. Peters Successor, who was chief of the Apostles, and that he is Christ's true Vicar, and Head of the whole Church, the Father and Doctor of all Christians; and that in S. Peter full power was given to him (the Bishop of Rome) by our Lord Jesus Christ, to feed, rule, and govern the whole Church. To this definition subscribed all the Patriarchs of the Church, and

G

amongst

amongst the rest the Patriarch of Constantinople himself. You shall have his subscription, as it is set down in the A&S of the Council. *Joseph miseratione divina Constantinopolis, &c. Florent. An. 1439.* I Joseph, by the mercy of God, Arch-bishop of Constantinople, and new Rome, and universal Patriarch, because my life is almost at an end, do therefore by the goodness of God, according to my duty, publish this my opinion to my beloved sons in this writing. For all those things which our Lord Jesus Christs Catholique and Apostolique Church of Old Rome believes and imbraces, I profess that I also do hold and believe, and fully consent unto them. And I grant, that the blessed Father of Fathers, and chief Priest, the Pope of Old Rome, is our Lord Iesus Christs Vicar, and I deny not that there is a Purgatory for souls. And note, that this is the profession of a dying man past hope of life. Here you see a concurrence of the later ages with the former. Here you see all the churches of the world consenting to the Primacy and Jurisdiction of the Church of Rome. Here you have seen the praise of the antient church, the Declarations of former Councils, and the Definitions of later; then which nothing can
better

better Interpret Scripture, or more faithfully preserve divine truths and Apostolical Doctrines to posterity.

Since then the Church of Rome is the *Head* and Mother-church of the world, and consequently the Fountain of Unity, whosoever shall separate himself from her communion, cannot possibly be a member of the Catholique Church: And since the Church of Rome by her power and Jurisdiction diffuses her self over all the parts of the Christian world, and as being the great Metropolitan of the world, infuses unity into all particular Churches and Christians, She is in this her largest amplitude properly and truly call'd the *Catholique Church*. And because the Catholique Church cannot fall into any error in faith, or any other damnable error whatsoever, nor teach Doctrines superstitious, sacrilegious, or repugnant to plain words of Scripture, because she is, and ever shall be guided by Gods Holy Spirit, which hitherto has, and ever shall lead her into all truth, therefore it cannot be truly said, that the Roman Church being this Catholique Church, ever was, or can be guilty of errors in faith, or of superstitious, sacrilegious, or any damnable Doctrines whatsoever.

73. Besides, when *Luther* first forsook the communion of the *Roman Church*, did he not stand alone? was he not divided from the world, even from those that were not in communion with the Church of Rome, as well as from those that were? did he communicate in the Sacraments, or external worship with any particular Church, Congregation, People, Nation, or Sect professing the name of *Christ*? can any man separate himself from that church, in whose communion he once liv'd, whose Faith and Doctrine he imbrac't, and joyn himself to no other congregation in the whole world, professing the name of *Christ*, either in doctrine or external communion, and yet be no Schismatic? If so, then there never was, or can be any Schism. If then *Luther* was Schismatical in being divided from the whole Christian world in Faith and communion, it necessarily follows, that all those who first adhered to him, forsaking the communion of that church, whereof they had formerly been members, and all those who have since followed *Luther*, and have not joyn'd themselves to any church or *Christian Congregation* whatsoever besides themselves, must be guilty of the same Schism. How then is it possible for you to
avoid

avoid the guilt of Schism, since you have forsaken the communion of the Church of Rome, with whom you once communicated, as you confess, Sect. 19. and have not joyn'd your selves to any other *Christian Congregation* whatsoever? You abhor the communion of the *Roman Church*, and that which you call the *Greek Church* abhors you. Will you say, that the Protestants are the whole *Catholique Church*? then you contradict your self, who grant Sect. 12. that *Rome her self is a Church, a member of the one Catholique*. You must also then confess, that the *Greek Church* (as you call it) is no part of the *Catholique Church*, and the truth is, you have good reason so to do, since she refused to receive you into her communion, abhorring and detesting your new *Doctrines*, as heretical: If then all those of the *Protestant Sect* be Schismatical (as it most plainly appears they are) certainly the Protestants of *England* must necessarily be involv'd in the same Schism.

74. Let us now see how you can vindicate your selves from heresie. I will not look beyond those four *Doctrines* where-with you have charg'd the Church of Rome, as being fond, sacrilegious, and repugnant to plain words of Scripture,

viz. *Transubstantiation, Administration of the B. Sacrament to the Laity in one kind; Invocation of Saints; Adoration of Images.* And by your opposing these doctrines as they are held and taught by the Roman Church, I shall endeavour to make it appear to the world, that you cannot avoid the just imputation of Heresie.

First then I demand, whether the Fathers assembled in the four first General Councils were not competent and lawful Judges of the heresies of those times; as the *Arrian, Macedonian, Nestorian, Eutychian, &c.* and whether they had not power to condemn those heresies, and to anathematize those that held and taught them as heretiques. If they had no such power, then did they most injuriously and tyrannically usurp a power and Jurisdiction, which of right belonged not unto them. But this cannot be prudently suppos'd, that so many holy, reverend, and learned Fathers should usurp an authority, or arrogate to themselves that power, which was not lawfully deriv'd upon them by Christ and his holy church: They were the selected Pastors of the whole church, men renowned for their piety and learning, and could not therefore be ignorant how far the Jurisdiction and authority of a lawful Council might extend;

rend; neither would their piety suffer them to transgress the limits of that authority. If then those four first Councils had power to judg of, and to declae and define doctrines of faith, and to anathematize all those that should oppose them; how came the Councils in succeeding ages to be depriv'd of this power? How came the church to lose that authority wherewith she was once invested? was her power but temporary, and after some few ages to expire? or did Christ foresee, that after some few ages his church would be no more infested with Schismatiques, or heretiques? but we plainly find, that such have molested the church in all ages, and therefore doubtless in all ages has this power continued in the church; and if so, why was it not as lawful for the second Council of *Nice* (which was held above 300. years since) to judg and define what reverence and honor is due to holy Images; and to condemn the *Iconoclasts* or Image-breakers, as it was for the former Councils to condemn the *Arrians*, *Nestorians*, &c? And why was it not as lawful for that great and glorious Council of *Lateran*, wherein were present both the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* and *Hierusalem*, to judg of, and declare the true, real, and substantial conversion of the creatures of bread

and wine after consecration, into the true and real body and bloud of Christ; and to declare the manner of that conversion, as also to express the antient doctrine of the church by the proper signification of a new word [*Transubstantiation*] as it was for the first General Council of *Nice* to judge of, and declare *Christs consubstantiality* with the Father, and to invent that new word to express the antient doctrine, descending unto them by universal and infallible Tradition of Christs co-eternal and co-equal *Divinity* with the Father? You wil find in *Vincensius Lyrinensis. c. 32.* that it was no new thing in his time for the church to invent new words to express old doctrines.

Why was it not lawful for the Council of *Constance* (*Sess. 13.*) to define and declare the indifferency and sufficiency of communicating the Laity under one kind only, and to anathematize those that should pertinaciously oppose that doctrine?

Lastly, why was it not lawful for the Council of *Trent* (*Sess. 25.*) to declare the lawfulness of invoking the blessed Saints, and to denounce a curse against all obstinate opposers thereof?

Thus you see those four fond and sacrilegious doctrines, and such as you say are repugnant to plain words of *Scripture*,
con-

confirm'd, declar'd, and defin'd to be sacred truths, and Apostolical Traditions by four General Councils. You have also seen them held and practis'd by the antient Fathers, that liv'd within the first 500. years of *Christianity*, Sect. 35. 36. 37. 38. &c. what can you say for your selves? what can you plead for your selves, that you, who deny the Doctrines of the church, should not incur the penalty of the curse?

75. You will say, perchance, that these are not Doctrines and Declarations of the whole Church Catholique, but of the Church of Rome only, and those in communion with her, which you say is but part of the *Catholike Church*. But this will not now serve your turn: whether the Church of Rome and those in communion with her, be a part only of the *Catholike Church*, or the whole *Catholike Church* it self, (as I have sufficiently prov'd it is) it matters not, you cannot be excus'd from heresie. For when *Luther* was a Fryer, before he set himself against the church, what church? what congregation of *Christians*? what Nation? what people? nay, what man was there in the whole world, professing the name of *Christ*, that denied or opposed those, or any one of those forementioned Doctrines? These were doctrines receiv'd, imbrac't, and publicly profess'd by the whole *Christian* world.

Not the Church of Rome, and those in communion with her only, but those also that were out of her communion (as the whole pretended *Greek Church*) receiv'd and profess these doctrines in their universal, publike and daily practise; as appears by *Jeremias Patriarch of Constantinople* in his *sententia definitiva de doctrina & Religione Wittenbergenſium Proteſtantium*: as also in his *Censura Orientalis Ecclesie*; where you shall find a detestation of your opposite doctrines.

76. But if those doctrines be fond, sacrilegious, and repugnant to plain words of Scripture, where was the church, that pillar and ground of truth, when the whole Christian world, before *Luthers* apostasie, receiv'd, held, and maintain'd them? and if those that shall thus separate themselves from, and oppose the whole church in doctrines of faith, receiv'd by the whole church as such, and acknowledg'd by her to be of universal and Apostolical tradition, be not heretiques, there never was, neither is it possible that there ever should be any heretique in the world. And yet yours was no separation, but a reformation. But what can be invented more absurd or ridiculous, then that one single apostate in *Germany*, or a few avaricious and flattering Courtiers in *England*. should first forsake

take the communion of that church where-
 in they had liv'd from their *Baptism*, and
 wherein all their forefathers for almost
 1000. years liv'd and died, and afterwards
 renounce doctrines of Faith universally re-
 ceiv'd by the church, and then take upon
 them to be Judges of the whole church,
 which Christ has made the Supreme Judg
 of all controversies, and to reform the
 whole church, and that in matters of do-
 ctrine? but you must know Doctor, that
 the *Catholique Church* cannot teach, or
 maintain sacrilegious doctrines, or such as
 are repugnant to plain words of *Scriptures*:
 For then she would cease to be *holy*, and
 consequently to be a church, *holiness* be-
 ing essential to Gods church; as appears
 both by the *Niceue* and *Apostles Creed*:
 If then the church should obtrude upon the
 world sacrilegious and idolatrous doctrines,
 and such as are repugnant to plain words
 of *Scripture*, instead of sacred and divine
 truths, she could not possibly be holy. Since
 then the whole Christian world, when *Lu-
 ther* was a *Fryer*, taught and maintain'd
 those four foremention'd Doctrines, which
 you are pleas'd to stile, *sacrilegious*, and
repugnant to plain words of Scripture,
 it must necessarily follow, that either at
 that time God had no church at all (which
 your

your self confess to be impossible, or els that those doctrines are not sacrilegious, or repugnant to plain words of *Scripture*, but sacred and Apostolical truths; and if so, what are those that oppose and contradict them?

77. Hence it appears, how false that is which you say, *Señ. 32. That you communicate with the Church of Rome in necessities, in Faith, Hope and Charity, &c.* since you oppose her in doctrines of *Faith*; and by your schisme (a sin directly against *Charity*) have cut your selves off from her communion. With what face then can you say, *Señ. 34. That you abhor not mutual communion with her in divine worship.* Do you not abhor to communicate with her in the Sacraments? Do you not call her adoration of Christ in the B. Sacrament *Idolatry*? And whereas you say there, *that you cannot endure that divine worship be given to any other then to the B. Trinity;* I would have you know, that the Church of Rome gives not divive worship to any thing but God; and if you will say that she does, you will but proove your self very malicious or very ignorant.

78. In your 35 *Señ.* I find nothing, but what is either impertinent, or already answered.

79. In

79. In the next *Señ.* I meet with a bold challenge. *I challenge* (saies the Doctor) *the most able of your faction to shew me any one passage in our Common-Prayer Book, that is not Catholique.*

Ans. If your Book of *Common-Prayer* be Catholique, yet you have no great reason to boast of it; you may thank the Church of *Rome* for it, from whom you borrowed it: which you know *Doctor*, was the principal reason, why those of the *Puritan* faction refus'd and abhor'd your Book of *Common-Prayer*, as being *Popish* and *superstitious*. But if all in that Book be Catholique, it is rather an argument, that the Church of *Rome* is Catholique, from whence you took it, then that you are so. For all in that Book may be Catholique, yet you may be Heretical. You may oppose, as you do, other doctrines of Faith, that are not contained in, nor deducible from your Book of *Common-Prayer*. And if about the beginning of your defection some Catholiques frequented your Service; it was because they esteem'd it devout and pious, as being all taken out of the *Office* and *Mis-sal* of the Church of *Rome*. They had not fully considered, nor yet cleerly apprehended the unlawfulness thereof. Wherefore it behoved the common Pastor of Gods Church

Church to put them in mind, how impious and sacrilegious it was for Catholiques to communicate with those, who were guilty both of Schism and Heresie, in divine Service.

80. And whereas you alledg *S. Paul* to prove that in meats and matters of indifferency, we are not to judge one another; you must know, Doctor, that Doctrines of faith, (such as are Declarations, and definitions of Generall Councils) the lawes and Canons of the Vniversall Church, made, and generally receiv'd by the Church, as the ancient Canons concerning Festivals, and Fasts, are not matters of indifferency; and cannot be violated without schism or Heresie.

81. But I wonder with what face you can call your Congregation the Mother-Church of Catholiques, Sect. 39. 'Tis you that have forsaken your Mother-Church, that Church wherein all your fore-fathers liv'd and died, for about. 1000. yeares together. you confesse that once you communicated with the Church of Rome, and that since you have forsaken her communion. Is it fit that the Church of Rome, whom you have forsaken, should stoop to you? Is she bound to follow you that have forsaken her? who made you Judges of Gods Church, that you should

should take upon you to charge the whole Church of *Rome* with errours, both in faith and manners? by what rule have you done this? you pretend *Seet. 37.* to walke by a sure rule; but I am sure you walke not according to the rule of *Christ's Catholique Church.* For she walks according to the rule of *Gods Word*, interpreted by universall and *Apostolicall* tradition, which you contemne and laugh at: but you, by the rule of *Scripture* interpreted by your own private fancies, and deceitfull imaginations.

82. Now the Doctor begins to quarrel with the Language of the Church of *Rome* *How do they* (saith he) *pray with the people, who pray in a tongue, the people understand not?* *Ans^r.* And why may not *Priest* and people joyne in heart to God in prayer, though the language of the Churches prayers be not understood by all present? *S. Paul* confesses, *1. Cor. 14. 14.* that a man may pray in spirit, in an unknowne tongue, though not with his understanding. The *Priest* and people of the *Jewes* could joyne together in prayer, and prayers to God, before *Christ*; though their Service were perform'd in the *Hebrew Tongue*, a language no more then understood by the vulgar *Jewes*, then the *Latin*

is now by the vulgar Christians, why then may not the Christian Priest and people joyne together in prayer, though the church Service be perform'd in a language, which some of the vulgar Christians, that are present, understand not? The *Hebrew, Greek,* and *Latin Tongues*, wherein only the church Service has been perform'd throughout the whole Christian world ever since the time of the Apostles, are languages well knowne to the world: all men may learne them. They are not such unknowne languages as those were, which *S. Paul* speaks of, *1. Cor. 14.* which were miraculously infus'd into many of the Primitive Christians, the end whereof was the edification of the church, and the conversion of Infidells. Now those tongues were neither understood by the people, nor alwaies by those that spake them, as appears, *1. Cor. 12.* and *1. Cor. 14. 13.* These languages miraculously infus'd by God, the Primitive Christians used in their publique meetings; first to instruct the ignorant; secondly to convert Infidells; where their instructions and prayers were alwayes extemporary, according as they were immediately assisted by Gods holy Spirit. But the publique prayers of the church are not in such unknowne languages. Secondly, they are said in the
same

same languages, wherein the publique Service of the church was ever performed in all ages since the Apostles, as appeares by the ancient *Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Missales*; which is an argument unanswerable, that such languages are not against *S. Pauls Doctrine*, 1. *Cor.* 14. nor any other place of Gods Word. Thirdly; the end of our present publique meetings in the church, is not to instruct, edifie, or convert, as those meetings were, whereof *S. Paul* speaks in that chapter; but to offer up to God the tribute of prayer and praises that is due unto him; as also to draw downe Gods blessings, both spirituall and temporall upon the people. And to this end the people joyne with the Priest in their exterior acts of devotion and Religion, thereby professing their assent to the publique prayers, and praises of the Church. And can it be thought necessary for those ends, that all the people present should expressly understand every word of the Churches Service, which though it were in the vulgar language of every Nation, would notwithstanding be impossible?

83. *Between the Eastern and Western Churches, you say, Sect. 40. there were many differences &c. and yet for all these they grew up together comfortably, and continued in the same body. Answ.* When the
dis-

differences between the Eastern and Western Churches were concerning such Doctrines as were not declar'd in any Generall Council, nor could appeare by the universall tradition or practise of the Church, they were then only errors, not heresies: but when any of the Easterne Churches opposed the Western in such Doctrines as appear'd either in the practise of the Church, or by universall tradition, and consent of Nations, or were declar'd and defin'd in a Generall Council, they then fell from error into heresie; and were thereby cut off from the Catholique Church.

Your 41. Sect. is answer'd, Sect. 29. and Sect. 65. and Sect. 30. 84. In your 42. Sect. you say, *That the keyes were given to all the Apostles alike.* *Ans.* This I confesse in some sense may be true, but makes nothing for you. That all the Apostles had the keyes of remitting and retaining sins, is true. I can grant also, that they were all universall Bishops; yet they had not all equally the keyes of externall government and Jurisdiction. S. Iohn at Ephesus had not that power, which S. Peter had at Antioch, or afterwards at Rome. For whatsoever S. Peter was, he had a Jurisdiction over the rest of the Apostles, as well as the whole Church besides, which S. Iohn never had.

Your

Your, 43. Sect. has been already fully answer'd.

Sect. 58. In your, 44. Sect. you say, out of S. Paul to Timothy. 2. *Timoth.* 3, 15. That the Scripture is able to make us wise unto salvation; and that you are resolved by Gods grace to accept of nothing, but what is deduced from thence, or proved thereby, according to the interpretation of the ancient Fathers and Councells. That of S. Paul I confesse; and withall very glad that you have made so good a resolution. If you shall constantly persist therein, and shall receive no interpretation of Scripture but from the ancient Fathers, Councells, and the tradition of the Church (as *Vincentius Lyrinensis* advises you, *ch.* 1.) you will soone become *Roman Catholics*.

Your 45. and last Sect. containes nothing but what has been by you said before, and by me sufficiently answer'd, Sect. 18. and. Sect. 21. 29. &c.

I have done with your *Answer*, and now crave leave to speake somewhat to you by way of exhortation in the Spirit of meeknesse.

You have hitherto been a guide to others; let not a vaine feare, or apprehension of any dishonour that may eclipse your former
re-

reputation, by confessing your errours, and
 that you have been a blind leader of the
 blind, come between you and your eternall
 Salvation. Let not the deceitfull lustre of
 vaine glory tempt you to preserve your cre-
 dit in the world, with the losse of Heaven.
 You owe God your reputation as well as
 your life, or whatsoever else is most deare
 unto you : consider at how deare a rate
Christ purchas'd the Redemption of your
 Soul : destroy not then that soul for which
Christ died. Let not pride, prejudice, or
 or malice cast a mist before the eyes of your
 understanding ; and you shall soone be-
 hold that light, which will infallibly guide
 you to your last end, *God* ; and the eternall
 fruition of the *Beatificall Vision*. Gods can-
 dle, since it was first lighted by *Christ* and
 and his *Apostles* was never put under a
 bushell ; but from the candlestick wherein
 it was first set, has given light to the world ;
 and all eyes, that are not blinded with ma-
 lice or interest, must behold it. You seeme
 to approve the Principles of *Vincentius*
Lyrinensis ; follow them, and you are safe.
 Let *Antiquity* and *Universality* be your
 guide, and you cannot erre. Let not some
 few scatter'd, obscure, and mis-understood
 places of some Fathers prevaile more with
 you, then a thousand plaine places, whole
 treatises

treatises and volumnes purposely pen'd in
 defence of Catholique truth. Divest your
 soul of pride, malice, and interest, and in-
 stead thereof let humility and impartiality
 take place, and then Gods grace will sweet-
 ly invite you to a sincere and humble ac-
 knowledgment of your errors, and you
 will with excessive joy and thankfulness of
 heart praise God for your deliverance from
 the bonds of darkness, and the jaws of
 death. Remember that the antient Fathers
 and Doctors of the church have con-
 demn'd you, the Councils both Oecume-
 nical and Provincial have declar'd against
 you; the universal doctrine and practise of
 the church, both before and after *Luthers*
Apostasie, have given sentence against you.
 And as for those *Canons*, which you have
 alledged in your book, you must needs
 know your self, that some of them make a-
 gainst you, others are impertinent, but none
 of them impugne the power and authority
 of *Christs Vicar*, (the Bishop of Rome)
 over the whole *Catholique Church*. Weigh
 all the Authorities of holy *Scripture*, and
antiquity for both sides; and see whe-
 ther there be not a thousand plain places a-
 gainst you, for one obscure (for plain you
 have none) for you, Your eternal salvati-
 on lyes at stake, rely not then on other
 mens,

mens, nor your own fallacious judgment, or fancy, in those things that concern your salvation. Let Gods holy church be your guide and interpreter of *Scripture*, lest you wrest it (as some did of whom *S. Peter* complains, *2 Pet. 3. 16.*) to your own damnation: consider that the best way to appease Gods wrath against you for your former misguiding and seducing poor ignorant souls to their eternal perdition, is now by your good example, in returning to your holy Mother the *Roman Catholique Church*, to draw others after you into the house of God, his *Church Militant*; that so hereafter ye may meet in his *Church Triumphant*. Let not those trifles of popular applause, or worldly reputation flatter you to hell, nor fear of the worlds censure fright you from heaven; be but humble and impartial, and it is as impossible for you not to be a *Roman Catholique* (at least in judgment and opinion) as it is for a man, that has the benefit of sight to open his eyes, and not to see light at noon day,

And now, *Doctor*, If you have met with any tart language in this my answer, you cannot justly be offended with me. It proceeded not from any malice that I can bear your person. For I profess upon the word of a Christian, I never heard of your name

(to

(to my remembrance,) before I saw this your book; and I am still so much a stranger to you, that I know neither the place of your abode, nor the present condition of your life. But I was somewhat provok't by your blasphemous speeches against Gods holy church by your unnecessary taunts, and causeless jeering of Mr. T. B. whose modesty in his letters to you was such, that I am sure he gave you no just cause to break out into such scurrilous and unseemly speeches against him.

I shall heartily pray, that instead of replying to this answer, you may be reconcil'd to Gods holy *Catholic Church*. Amen.

F I N I S.

POSTSCRIPT.

IF the Doctor or any of his Party, be yet unsatisfied in this Controversie, I propose, that, rather then bestow a Reply to these cursory Papers of mine, the most Learned of them would considerately examine Mr. Cressly's Exomologesis, or Motives of his conversion, &c. and Rushworths Dialogues, in the last Edition, as it is corrected and enlarged by Mr. Thomas White, in a 8^o, of the Long-Primer letter; both which they must acknowledge to be as much unanswerable, as these light papers of Dr. Boughens are fully answered.

ERRATA:

PAge 17. line 23. read, as Rome. p. 36.
l. 18. r. were a great. p. 59. l. 18. r. co-
etanean. p. 63. l. 21. r. τδ. p. 65. l. 23. r.
but a. p. 67. l. 24. r. verum &, and l. 25.
non fide. p. 78. l. 7. r. as well as. p. 79 l.
27. r. offerunt. p. 82. l. 8. r. prayers made
at. p. 86. l. 10. r. is it. p. 114. l. 7. r. sixth
Century. p. 115. l. 13. r. nor Apost. p. 118.
l. 21. r. odious. and l. last. r. your taxing.
p. 119. l. 17. r. clesia. p. 126. l. 13. dele of.
p. 127. l. 28. r. ad. p. 137. l. 27. r. makes no.

